

Matsui	Payne (NJ)	Stark
McCarthy	Pelosi	Stokes
McDermott	Peterson (FL)	Studds
McHale	Pickett	Tanner
McKeon	Pomeroy	Thompson
McKinney	Radanovich	Thornton
McNulty	Rangel	Thurman
Meehan	Reed	Torkildsen
Meek	Richardson	Torres
Menendez	Rivers	Torricelli
Meyers	Roemer	Towns
Mfume	Rose	Trafficant
Miller (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Velazquez
Minge	Rush	Vento
Mink	Sabo	Visclosky
Moorhead	Sanders	Ward
Moran	Sawyer	Waters
Morella	Schroeder	Watt (NC)
Nadler	Schumer	Waxman
Neal	Scott	Williams
Obey	Serrano	Wise
Olver	Sisisky	Woolsey
Owens	Skaggs	Wyden
Pallone	Slaughter	Wynn
Pastor	Spratt	Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—10

Fields (LA)	Portman	Volkmer
Gephardt	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (PA)
Moakley	Tejeda	
Norwood	Tucker	

□ 1556

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DE LA GARZA and Mr. OBERSTAR changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 750 on H.R. 2492, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yes" when I should have voted "no."

# CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104—130)

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

## To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iran emergency is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 1995, to the *Federal Register* for publication. Similar notices have been sent annually to the Congress and the *Federal Register* since November 12, 1980. The most recent notice appeared in the *Federal Register* on November 1, 1994.

The crisis between the United States and Iran that began in 1979 has not been fully resolved. The international tribunal established to adjudicate claims of the United States and U.S. nationals against Iran and of the Iranian government and Iranian nationals against the United States continues to function, and normalization of commercial and diplomatic relations between the United States and Iran has not been achieved. Indeed, on March 15 of this year, I declared a separate national emergency with respect to Iran pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and imposed separate sanctions. By Executive Order 12959, these sanctions were significantly augmented. In these circumstances, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities that are in place by virtue of the November 14, 1979, declaration of emergency, including the authority to block certain property of the Government of Iran, and which are needed in the process of implementing the January 1981 agreements with Iran.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 31, 1995.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1868), making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 26, 1995, at page H10974.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1868, now under consideration, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to bring back to the House the conference report on H.R. 1868, the fiscal year 1996 appropriations for Foreign Operations,

Export Financing, and Related Programs.

The conference agreement represents a reduction of approximately \$1.5 billion, or 11 percent, below the 1995 enacted level. It is also a cut of almost \$2.7 billion, or 18 percent, below the President's request.

In addition, we are below the budget allocation for this bill by \$156 million in discretionary budget authority.

The agreement protects important child survival and disease programs, as we had proposed in the House bill. The Senate bill contained no protections whatsoever for these programs. The conferees also direct that \$100 million be provided for UNICEF, instead of a cut as assumed in the Senate bill.

In general, the House bill did not include authorization provisions that were not cleared by the relevant authorization committees. I can honestly say that I did not want authorization language on our appropriation bill. I have great respect for Chairman GILMAN and his colleagues on the International Relations Committee and I did my utmost to eliminate objectionable authorization language when the House considered H.R. 1868. However, the Senate included dozens of legislative provisions in the 193 amendments it made to the House bill. We were successful in deleting many of these in conference.

We also worked with the authorization committee to modify or retain those provisions of most interest to them. In particular, we worked closely with them on the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act and the NATO Participation Act amendments.

As I stated earlier, we had 193 Senate amendments to contend with in conference, and we were able to reach an agreement on all but one. The Senate conferees refused to accept the will of the House of Representatives on population funding and abortion.

Once the House has acted on the conference report, under the rule, I will ask the House to send back to the Senate the substance of a compromise amendment I offered in conference on the Mexico City abortion policy. This compromise has the support of the author of the amendment that was approved by the House, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

There are several matters in the conference agreement that merit further comment and clarification today.

With regard to concerns about conference report language on Azerbaijan, I want to repeat the statement I made before the Rules Committee: As chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I expect to be consulted in advance and notified in writing on a case by case basis each time the President uses the limited waiver provided by the Wilson amendment.

Until the parties involved meet and agree to reduce the tension in the Caucasus region and terminate all blockades, which I believe is possible in

coming months, this provision is a temporary, highly conditional waiver of aid to refugees and displaced persons only in Azerbaijan. It in no way overturns the much more extensive limitations on aid under current law, all of which are currently subject to a Presidential waiver.

Once Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia agree to open railroads, pipelines, and other communications in the region, the President will be in a position to make the determination required under section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, and the Wilson provision will no longer be relevant.

With regard to language prohibiting the Agency for International Develop-

ment's move to the elaborate and expensive new Federal Triangle Building, the language means just what it says. Before the Administrator of AID undertakes any other move that may be required, I expect him to fully consult with the Foreign Operations Subcommittee and make the reports requested by the conferees.

No funds are provided in this conference agreement for AID's move to the Federal Triangle. No other funds should be used for a move to the Federal Triangle. As far as this committee is concerned, that proposal is denied.

In conclusion, I'd like to thank my ranking minority member, Mr. WILSON, for his invaluable assistance in reach-

ing a conference agreement on this bill. I'd also like to pay tribute to Mr. OBEY, the ranking Democrat on the full committee, for his assistance and advice throughout this process. I'm happy to say that they and all the other House and Senate members of the conference have signed the conference report.

In closing, I would remind the House that other members and the administration are ready and willing to add millions to this bill. Defeating this conference agreement would leave the door open for another bill that would cut less than this one.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following material:

## FY 1996 FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1868)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES</b>						
<b>Limitation of Program Activity:</b>						
Subsidy appropriations.....	786,551,000	823,000,000	786,551,000	795,000,000	786,551,000	.....
Administrative expenses.....	45,228,000	47,000,000	45,228,000	48,000,000	45,814,000	+386,000
Negative subsidy.....	-49,856,000	-89,846,000	-89,846,000	-89,846,000	-89,846,000	-39,990,000
<b>Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States.....</b>	<b>782,123,000</b>	<b>780,354,000</b>	<b>742,133,000</b>	<b>751,354,000</b>	<b>742,519,000</b>	<b>-39,804,000</b>
<b>OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION</b>						
Operating expenses.....	7,933,000	16,000,000	15,500,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	+7,087,000
Non-credit administrative expenses.....	16,389,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	-5,389,000
Insurance fees and other offsetting collections.....	-151,820,000	-202,500,000	-202,500,000	-202,500,000	-202,500,000	-50,680,000
<b>Direct loans:</b>						
Loan subsidy.....	8,214,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-4,214,000
(Loan authorization).....	(19,895,000)	(79,523,000)	(79,523,000)	(79,523,000)	(79,523,000)	(+59,628,000)
<b>Guaranteed loans:</b>						
Loan subsidy.....	25,730,000	75,000,000	65,500,000	75,000,000	68,000,000	+42,270,000
(Loan authorization).....	(481,913,000)	(1,491,054,000)	(1,302,000,000)	(1,491,054,000)	(1,351,900,000)	(+189,987,000)
<b>Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation.....</b>	<b>-93,354,000</b>	<b>-66,500,000</b>	<b>-106,500,000</b>	<b>-97,500,000</b>	<b>-104,500,000</b>	<b>-11,148,000</b>
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
<b>Trade and Development Agency</b>						
Trade and development agency.....	40,986,000	67,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	-986,000
<b>Total, title I, Export and investment assistance.....</b>	<b>729,755,000</b>	<b>750,854,000</b>	<b>675,633,000</b>	<b>693,854,000</b>	<b>678,019,000</b>	<b>-51,736,000</b>
(Loan authorizations).....	(501,808,000)	(1,570,577,000)	(1,381,523,000)	(1,570,577,000)	(1,431,423,000)	(+189,615,000)
<b>TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
<b>Agency for International Development</b>						
Economic assistance.....	.....	.....	.....	2,117,099,331	.....	.....
Children and disease programs fund.....	.....	.....	592,680,000	.....	.....	.....
Development assistance fund.....	799,200,000	1,300,000,000	655,000,000	.....	1,675,000,000	+875,800,000
Population, development assistance.....	431,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-431,000,000
Development Fund for Africa.....	781,000,000	802,000,000	528,000,000	.....	.....	-781,000,000
International disaster assistance.....	169,998,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	175,000,000	181,000,000	+11,002,000
Debt restructuring.....	7,000,000	25,500,000	7,000,000	(15,000,000)	10,000,000	+3,000,000
Debt restructuring under the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative (rescission).....	-2,400,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+2,400,000
<b>Micro and Small Enterprise Development program:</b>						
Subsidy appropriations.....	1,500,000	12,000,000	1,500,000	(1,500,000)	1,500,000	.....
Administrative expenses.....	500,000	2,500,000	500,000	(500,000)	500,000	.....
(Direct loan authorization).....	(1,000,000)	(3,540,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(+435,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization).....	(18,564,000)	(138,880,000)	(16,700,000)	(16,700,000)	(16,700,000)	(-1,864,000)
<b>Housing and other credit guaranty programs:</b>						
Subsidy appropriations.....	19,300,000	18,780,000	.....	(8,000,000)	4,000,000	-15,300,000
Operating expenses.....	8,000,000	7,240,000	7,000,000	(7,000,000)	7,000,000	-1,000,000
(Guaranteed loan authorization).....	(137,474,000)	(141,886,000)	.....	(67,400,000)	(33,700,000)	(-103,774,000)
<b>Subtotal, development assistance.....</b>	<b>2,215,098,000</b>	<b>2,366,000,000</b>	<b>1,991,980,000</b>	<b>2,292,099,331</b>	<b>1,878,000,000</b>	<b>-338,098,000</b>
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund.....	45,118,000	43,914,000	43,914,000	43,914,000	43,914,000	-1,204,000
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development.....	515,500,000	529,000,000	465,750,000	460,000,000	465,750,000	-49,750,000
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General.....	39,118,000	39,118,000	35,200,000	30,200,000	30,200,000	-8,918,000
<b>Subtotal, Agency for International Development.....</b>	<b>2,814,834,000</b>	<b>2,978,032,000</b>	<b>2,536,524,000</b>	<b>2,856,213,331</b>	<b>2,418,884,000</b>	<b>-395,970,000</b>
<b>Other Bilateral Economic Assistance</b>						
Economic support fund.....	2,324,000,000	2,484,300,000	2,300,000,000	.....	2,340,000,000	+16,000,000
Middle East fund.....	.....	.....	.....	2,015,000,000	.....	.....
International fund for Ireland.....	19,800,000	.....	19,800,000	.....	19,800,000	.....
Assistance for Eastern Europe.....	359,000,000	480,000,000	324,000,000	335,000,000	324,000,000	-35,000,000
<b>Assistance for the New Independent States of the Soviet Union:</b>						
Union.....	817,500,000	788,000,000	580,000,000	705,000,000	641,000,000	-176,500,000
Debt restructuring: Debt relief for Jordan.....	275,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-275,000,000
Procurement: General provisions.....	-1,598,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+1,598,000
<b>Subtotal, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance.....</b>	<b>3,793,502,000</b>	<b>3,762,300,000</b>	<b>3,223,800,000</b>	<b>3,055,000,000</b>	<b>3,324,800,000</b>	<b>-468,902,000</b>
<b>Total, Agency for International Development.....</b>	<b>6,608,336,000</b>	<b>6,740,332,000</b>	<b>5,760,124,000</b>	<b>5,911,213,331</b>	<b>5,743,684,000</b>	<b>-864,872,000</b>

## FY 1996 FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1868) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>Independent Agencies</b>						
<b>African Development Foundation</b>						
Appropriations .....	18,805,000	17,405,000	11,500,000			-18,805,000
<b>Inter-American Foundation</b>						
Appropriations .....	30,980,000	31,780,000	20,000,000			-30,980,000
<b>Total, Funds Appropriated to the President .....</b>	<b>6,656,201,000</b>	<b>6,789,497,000</b>	<b>5,791,624,000</b>	<b>5,911,213,331</b>	<b>5,743,484,000</b>	<b>-912,737,000</b>
<b>Peace Corps</b>						
Appropriations .....	219,745,000	234,000,000	210,000,000	200,000,000	205,000,000	-14,745,000
<b>Department of State</b>						
International narcotics control .....	105,000,000	213,000,000	113,000,000	150,000,000	115,000,000	+10,000,000
(By transfer) .....				(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
Migration and refugee assistance .....	671,000,000	671,000,000	671,000,000	671,000,000	671,000,000	
Refugee resettlement assistance .....	6,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	-1,000,000
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund .....	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	
Anti-terrorism assistance .....	15,244,000	15,000,000	17,000,000	15,000,000	16,000,000	+756,000
Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund .....	10,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	+10,000,000
<b>Total, Department of State .....</b>	<b>857,244,000</b>	<b>974,000,000</b>	<b>876,000,000</b>	<b>906,000,000</b>	<b>877,000,000</b>	<b>+19,756,000</b>
<b>Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance .....</b>	<b>7,733,190,000</b>	<b>7,997,497,000</b>	<b>6,877,624,000</b>	<b>7,017,213,331</b>	<b>6,825,484,000</b>	<b>-907,728,000</b>
(By transfer) .....				(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
(Loan authorizations) .....	(157,036,000)	(284,306,000)	(18,136,000)	(85,535,000)	(51,835,000)	(-106,203,000)
<b>TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
International Military Education and Training .....	25,500,000	39,781,000	36,000,000	19,000,000	36,000,000	+13,500,000
(By transfer) .....	(850,000)					(-850,000)
Military to military contact .....	12,000,000					-12,000,000
Foreign Military Financing Program:						
Grants .....	3,151,279,000	3,262,020,000	3,211,279,000	3,207,500,000	3,206,390,000	+57,111,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(22,150,000)	(24,020,000)	(24,000,000)	(22,500,000)	(23,250,000)	(+1,100,000)
Direct concessional loans:						
Subsidy appropriations .....	47,917,000	89,888,000	64,400,000	64,400,000	64,400,000	+18,483,000
(Loan authorization) .....	(619,650,000)	(765,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(-75,650,000)
FMF program level .....	(3,770,829,000)	(4,027,020,000)	(3,755,279,000)	(3,751,500,000)	(3,752,390,000)	(-18,536,000)
<b>Total, Foreign military assistance .....</b>	<b>3,166,166,000</b>	<b>3,351,908,000</b>	<b>3,275,679,000</b>	<b>3,271,900,000</b>	<b>3,272,790,000</b>	<b>+73,584,000</b>
Special Defense Acquisition Fund: Offsetting collections .....	-282,000,000	-220,000,000	-220,000,000	-220,000,000	-220,000,000	+82,000,000
Peacekeeping operations .....	72,000,000	100,000,000	68,300,000	72,033,000	70,000,000	-2,000,000
<b>Total, title III, Military assistance programs .....</b>	<b>3,026,966,000</b>	<b>3,271,688,000</b>	<b>3,162,679,000</b>	<b>3,142,933,000</b>	<b>3,161,790,000</b>	<b>+135,084,000</b>
(By transfer) .....	(850,000)					(-850,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(22,150,000)	(24,020,000)	(24,000,000)	(22,500,000)	(23,250,000)	(+1,100,000)
(Loan authorization) .....	(619,650,000)	(765,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(-75,650,000)
<b>TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
<b>International Financial Institutions</b>						
<b>World Bank Group</b>						
Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:						
Paid-in capital .....	23,009,101	26,189,983	23,009,000	26,189,983	26,189,983	+5,180,882
(Limitation on callable capital) .....	(743,923,914)	(911,475,013)	(743,900,000)	(911,475,013)	(911,475,013)	(+167,551,099)
Contribution to the International Finance Corporation .....	68,743,028	67,558,000	67,550,000	67,550,000	60,900,000	-7,843,028
Contribution to the Global Environment Facility .....	90,000,000	110,000,000	30,000,000	50,000,000	35,000,000	-55,000,000
<b>Total, contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development .....</b>	<b>(625,676,043)</b>	<b>(1,117,220,978)</b>	<b>(664,458,000)</b>	<b>(1,067,214,978)</b>	<b>(1,035,584,978)</b>	<b>(+109,888,933)</b>
Contribution to the International Development Association .....	1,175,000,000	1,368,188,000	575,000,000	775,000,000	700,000,000	-475,000,000
<b>Total, World Bank Group .....</b>	<b>(2,100,676,043)</b>	<b>(2,485,386,978)</b>	<b>(1,436,458,000)</b>	<b>(1,832,214,978)</b>	<b>(1,735,584,978)</b>	<b>(-365,111,067)</b>
Budget authority .....	1,358,732,129	1,573,913,963	696,559,000	920,739,963	824,089,963	-532,882,166
(Limitation on callable capital) .....	(743,923,914)	(911,475,013)	(743,900,000)	(911,475,013)	(911,475,013)	(+167,551,099)

## FY 1996 FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1868) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:</b>						
Inter-regional paid-in capital .....	26,111,989	26,952,110	25,950,000	25,952,110	25,952,110	-2,159,849
(Limitation on callable capital) .....	(1,584,566,180)	(1,523,767,142)	(1,523,000,000)	(1,523,767,142)	(1,523,767,142)	(-70,801,036)
Fund for special operations .....	21,338,000	20,835,000	.....	20,000,000	10,000,000	-11,338,000
Enterprises for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund .....	75,000,000	100,000,000	70,000,000	115,000,000	53,750,000	-21,250,000
Inter-American Investment Corporation .....	190,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-190,000
<b>Total, contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank.....</b>	<b>(1,719,206,139)</b>	<b>(1,670,554,252)</b>	<b>(1,618,950,000)</b>	<b>(1,684,719,252)</b>	<b>(1,613,469,252)</b>	<b>(-105,738,887)</b>
<b>Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:</b>						
Paid-in capital .....	.....	13,221,596	13,200,000	13,221,596	13,221,596	+13,221,596
(Limitation on callable capital) .....	.....	(647,858,204)	(647,000,000)	(647,858,204)	(647,858,204)	(+647,858,204)
Development fund .....	167,980,000	304,528,525	100,000,000	110,000,000	100,000,000	-67,980,000
<b>Total, contribution to the Asian Development Bank.....</b>	<b>(167,980,000)</b>	<b>(965,808,325)</b>	<b>(760,200,000)</b>	<b>(771,079,800)</b>	<b>(761,079,800)</b>	<b>(+563,119,800)</b>
<b>Contribution to the African Development Fund.....</b>	<b>62,215,309</b>	<b>127,247,025</b>	.....	.....	.....	<b>-62,215,309</b>
<b>Contribution to the African Development Bank:</b>						
Paid-in capital .....	133,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-133,000
(Limitation on callable capital) .....	(2,002,540)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-2,002,540)
<b>Total, contribution to the African Development Bank.....</b>	<b>(2,135,540)</b>	.....	.....	.....	.....	<b>(-2,135,540)</b>
<b>Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:</b>						
Paid-in capital .....	69,180,353	81,918,447	69,180,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	+819,647
(Limitation on callable capital) .....	(161,420,824)	(191,138,378)	(161,400,000)	(163,333,333)	(163,333,333)	(+1,912,509)
<b>Total, contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development .....</b>	<b>(230,801,177)</b>	<b>(273,054,823)</b>	<b>(230,580,000)</b>	<b>(233,333,333)</b>	<b>(233,333,333)</b>	<b>(+2,732,156)</b>
<b>North American Development Bank:</b>						
Paid-in capital .....	.....	56,250,000	56,250,000	25,000,000	56,250,000	+56,250,000
(Limitation on callable capital) .....	.....	(318,750,000)	(318,750,000)	(318,750,000)	(318,750,000)	(+318,750,000)
<b>International Monetary Fund</b>						
<b>Contribution to the enhanced structural adjustment facility .....</b>	<b>25,000,000</b>	<b>25,000,000</b>	.....	.....	.....	<b>-25,000,000</b>
<b>Total, contribution to International Financial Institutions .....</b>	<b>(4,307,796,208)</b>	<b>(5,921,853,401)</b>	<b>(4,424,189,000)</b>	<b>(4,865,087,361)</b>	<b>(4,718,447,361)</b>	<b>(+410,651,153)</b>
Budget authority .....	1,805,880,750	2,326,864,666	1,030,136,000	1,269,913,669	1,153,286,669	-652,617,061
(Limitation on callable capital) .....	(2,501,915,458)	(3,582,968,735)	(3,394,050,000)	(3,565,183,662)	(3,565,183,662)	(+1,063,288,234)
<b>International Organizations and Programs</b>						
International organizations and programs .....	359,000,000	425,000,000	155,000,000	280,000,000	285,000,000	-74,000,000
(By transfer) .....	.....	.....	(15,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+30,000,000)
<b>Total, title IV, contribution for Multilateral Economic Assistance .....</b>	<b>(4,886,796,208)</b>	<b>(6,348,853,401)</b>	<b>(4,579,189,000)</b>	<b>(5,125,087,361)</b>	<b>(5,003,447,361)</b>	<b>(+336,651,153)</b>
Budget authority .....	2,164,880,750	2,753,864,666	1,185,136,000	1,559,913,669	1,436,283,669	-726,617,061
(By transfer) .....	.....	.....	(15,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+30,000,000)
(Limitation on callable capital) .....	(2,501,915,458)	(3,582,968,735)	(3,394,050,000)	(3,565,183,662)	(3,565,183,662)	(+1,063,288,234)
<b>Grand total, all titles:</b>						
New budget (obligational) authority .....	13,854,521,750	14,773,904,666	11,901,375,000	12,413,914,000	12,103,538,669	-1,550,985,081
(By transfer) .....	(850,000)	.....	(15,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(+49,150,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(22,150,000)	(24,020,000)	(24,000,000)	(22,500,000)	(23,250,000)	(+1,100,000)
(Limitation on callable capital) .....	(2,501,915,458)	(3,582,968,735)	(3,394,050,000)	(3,565,183,662)	(3,565,183,662)	(+1,063,288,234)
(Loan authorizations) .....	(1,278,498,000)	(2,619,883,000)	(1,943,656,000)	(2,200,112,000)	(2,027,256,000)	(+748,762,000)
<b>TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE</b>						
Export Assistance Appropriations .....	931,031,000	1,043,000,000	967,779,000	966,000,000	970,185,000	+39,134,000
Negative Subsidies and Offsetting Collections .....	-201,278,000	-292,146,000	-292,146,000	-292,146,000	-292,146,000	-90,870,000
<b>Total, Export Assistance .....</b>	<b>729,753,000</b>	<b>750,854,000</b>	<b>675,633,000</b>	<b>683,854,000</b>	<b>678,039,000</b>	<b>-51,736,000</b>
<b>TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE</b>						
Bilateral Development Assistance .....	3,939,688,000	4,235,197,000	3,854,024,000	3,982,213,331	3,500,864,000	-436,824,000
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance .....	3,793,502,000	3,782,300,000	3,223,600,000	3,055,000,000	3,324,600,000	-468,602,000
<b>Total, Bilateral Economic Assistance .....</b>	<b>7,733,190,000</b>	<b>7,997,497,000</b>	<b>6,877,624,000</b>	<b>7,017,213,331</b>	<b>6,825,464,000</b>	<b>-907,726,000</b>
<b>TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>Foreign Military Financing Program:</b>						
Grants .....	3,151,279,000	3,262,020,000	3,211,279,000	3,207,500,000	3,208,380,000	+57,111,000
Direct loans, subsidy costs .....	47,917,000	69,668,000	64,400,000	64,400,000	64,400,000	+16,463,000
(Estimated level of direct loans) .....	(619,650,000)	(765,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(544,000,000)	(-75,850,000)
<b>Subtotal, Foreign Military Financing Program:</b>						
Budget authority .....	3,189,196,000	3,361,908,000	3,275,679,000	3,271,900,000	3,272,780,000	+73,594,000
(Program level) .....	(3,770,929,000)	(4,027,020,000)	(3,755,279,000)	(3,751,500,000)	(3,752,380,000)	(-18,536,000)

## FY 1996 FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1868) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Other, Military .....	106,500,000	136,781,000	107,300,000	91,033,000	106,000,000	-500,000
Special Defense Acquisition Fund .....	-262,000,000	-220,000,000	-220,000,000	-220,000,000	-220,000,000	+62,000,000
Total, Military Assistance Programs .....	3,026,696,000	3,271,889,000	3,162,976,000	3,142,933,000	3,161,790,000	+135,094,000
TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
Contributions to International Financial Institutions .....	1,780,880,750	2,303,864,866	1,030,139,000	1,299,913,669	1,153,263,669	-627,617,061
International Monetary Fund (IMF) .....	25,000,000	25,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-25,000,000
International organizations and programs .....	359,000,000	425,000,000	155,000,000	280,000,000	285,000,000	-74,000,000
Total, contribution for Multilateral Economic Assistance .....	2,164,880,750	2,753,864,866	1,185,139,000	1,559,913,669	1,438,263,669	-726,617,061
Grand total, all titles .....	13,654,521,750	14,773,904,866	11,901,375,000	12,413,914,000	12,103,536,669	-1,550,985,061

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with a mixed recommendation on the foreign operations appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

On one hand I support passage of the conference report on the bill. Although I am not fully happy with every aspect of the conference report—especially with the large number of earmarks included under the account funding the former Soviet Union—based on the funding available it is as good as we can do. The \$12.1 billion bill is \$2.7 billion below the President's request, \$1.6 billion below last year, \$202 million above the House-passed bill and \$310 million below the Senate bill.

Therefore I urge Members to support the conference report.

On the other hand, the conference was not able to come to an agreement on how to handle language in the bill concerning the so-called Mexico City policy language that Representative SMITH had added on the floor. The administration has informed me that if this language remains in the bill, the President will veto the bill.

In addition to the Presidential veto that would be created by this language, the Senate appears totally unwillingly to accept this language—therefore we can't even get a bill to the President with this language included in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, if Congress is serious about sending a signal to the President for fiscal year 1996 foreign operations, then I urge Members to reject the amendment by Mr. CALLAHAN adding the Mexico City language back into the bill.

Finally, I want to thank Chairman CALLAHAN for his cooperation and manner in handling the conference on the bill. I believe we have been able to come up with a bipartisan agreement on foreign assistance for fiscal year 1996, and therefore one that is in the best interest of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time. I commend both he and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] for their splendid work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1996 Foreign Operations Appropriations Conference report. We are continuing the downward trend in foreign aid spending that has occurred over the last decade.

We spent \$18.3 billion on foreign operations in fiscal year 1985, which is \$25 billion in today's dollars. This bill is \$12.1 billion. We have cut foreign aid in half over 11 years.

Mr. CALLAHAN worked with members of the subcommittee, the authorizing committee, the administration, and our Senate counterparts to allocate the shrinking foreign assistance dollars in the fairest manner possible. The conference report was signed by every member of the conference committee. This bipartisan support is a great tribute to the spirit of compromise exhibited by the subcommittee chairman and the members of the committee.

This bill cuts \$1.5 billion from last year's level, and \$2.8 billion from the President's request. We are 11 percent below last year and 18 percent below the President. Despite the cuts, we have protected the most vulnerable—the world's children.

The conference report provides \$300 million for child survival programs, which is \$25 million more than current year funding.

This bill reduces old-style government-to-government foreign aid. Instead, we invest in programs that allow private companies to expand exports and foreign investment to make broad-based economic growth a reality in developing free markets.

We have avoided the temptation to score political potshots with this bill. We vastly curtailed the numerous Senate earmarks which would have interfered with our Nation's foreign policy. We cut spending, but we provide the President with the resources to conduct a global foreign policy.

We have accepted the reorganization savings made by the authorizing committee, and kept the funding levels in line with the levels provided in H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act.

We have maintained the funding levels to meet our Camp David commitments for Egypt and Israel.

And, we've made children a priority.

This is a responsible and balanced bill and I urge your support for Mr. CALLAHAN's good work.

I also want to address a few of the important foreign policy issues which were included in this appropriations bill.

Brown amendment:

The conferees agreed to the Brown amendment which brings some fairness to our relations with Pakistan.

Because of the Pressler amendment, the United States currently holds F-16's and other military equipment that was purchased by Pakistan in the 1980's, and we hold the money Pakistan paid for the equipment.

President Clinton stated that it is "unfair to keep both Pakistan's money and its equipment."

Under the Brown amendment, we will sell the F-16's to a third country and reimburse Pakistan's investment, and we will deliver the 5-year-old equipment that Pakistan purchased before the Pressler sanction took effect.

This is an important compromise which keeps in place the Pressler amendment restrictions against military assistance and military sales, but allows assistance for counternarcotics control, humanitarian assistance, and antiterrorism.

The Brown amendment will go a long way to repair relations with Pakistan which has a long history of support for United States, especially during cold war:

Pakistan signed Mutual Defense Treaty with the United States and allowed United States bases to conduct reconnaissance flights over the Soviet Union during cold war.

Pakistan joined anti-Communist alliances such as CENTO and SEATO which were designed to contain Soviet Union.

Pakistan joined the United States in to rolling-back Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Pakistan supported the United States in Persian Gulf.

Pakistan contributes U.N. troops to Bosnia, Haiti, Somalia, and others.

Pakistan is a moderate, Islamic ally.

The Brown amendment doesn't resume military assistance to Pakistan, it merely allows return of military equipment which had been purchased more than 5 years ago.

KEDO;

We have also reached a compromise with the administration over promises the administration made to encourage North Korea to discontinue its dangerous nuclear program.

The conference report provides that the United States may contribute funds to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization [KEDO] for administrative expenses and heavy fuel oil costs associated with the agreed framework. However, none of the funds in the bill may be used to contribute to the lightweight nuclear reactors being provided to North Korea under the terms of the agreed framework.

Turkey:

I would also like to note that the conference committee limited economic support funds to Turkey in recognition of the strong concerns over Turkey's human rights record. However, we avoided more onerous language which would have damaged our important bilateral relationship with Turkey.

I want to bring my colleagues attention to an important article in yesterday's Washington Times. As the article indicates, Turkey is at a crossroads. Turkey's leaders are trying to direct Turkey to align with the western nations, but Islamic fundamentalists are working to push Turkey away from the European Union and NATO, and associate more closely with Islamic nations in the Arab world and central Asia.

We must be careful to urge Turkey to adopt basic human rights in their counterterrorism efforts against the PKK, but we must not push so hard that we drive Turkey into the Islamic fundamentalist fold.

Turkey is making efforts to improve its record. The State Department report on situation in Turkey contends that Turkey has started human rights training for military, made public the Code of Conduct for the military, and it has passed democracy-expanding proposals in the parliament. The State Department stated in July, "We can and should expect progress."

Just this week, Turkey adopted amendments to Article 8 of the controversial antiterrorism law. The State Department spokesman Nicholas Burns stated:

The United States is pleased to note that on October 27, Turkey's Parliament approved legislation amending Article 8 of the Anti-Terror Law. We congratulate the Turkish Government, Parliament, and people on this important and positive step forward for democracy and human rights.

I think this Congress should recognize Turkey's positive steps to reform their human rights policies.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. Mr. Speaker, the

gentleman from Illinois is rock rib in his perseverance of his ideals and philosophies. The gentleman is a valuable member of our subcommittee. I do not know what we would do without the gentleman.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

I commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and his capable subcommittee staff for their hard work on this conference report—it represents the product of thousands of hours of work and 10 hour conference with the other body.

And I would note, in light of the bill totals that we today consider, that foreign aid spending has clearly made its contribution to deficit reduction.

I also want to particularly note a number of matters addressed in this conference report:

First, I am pleased that we have maintained our commitment to the Camp David peace partners, and also to the ongoing peace process while, at the same time, including reasonable accountability requirements on recipients of peace process assistance. These provisions represent a sensible approach to accountability and one that will not impede the peace process.

Second, I am also pleased that we have maintained our commitment to the reunification of Cyprus with a continuation of \$15 million in support for bicomunal efforts on the island.

Third, similarly, I rise in strong support of the full funding for Armenia that we have included. Armenia is proving itself to be a model for other Newly Independent States in developing democratic institutions and practices and resisting extremist views. The \$85 million in humanitarian assistance, together with the other funds for Armenia requested by the administration are included in this conference report. These funds are vitally important and I am pleased that they are included.

Fourth, unfortunately, the levels of support for some activities in this bill are not what they should be.

First, I note that the conference report contains \$35 million toward the global environment facility, a project initiated by President Bush. While I am glad that we are maintaining support of this activity, I think all members should note that the GEF has done more than its share toward deficit reduction.

Second, I am pleased that we were able to somewhat restore the reductions in assistance to international organizations, with language allowing administrative flexibility in this account. I encourage the President to maintain a strong level of commitment to the United Nations Development Program, as the resources to do so are available. The UNDP is headed by a very capable American, Mr. Gus Speth, and we should give him our strong support. Similarly, the President must also maintain support for the U.N.'s fund for victims of torture.

I also am pleased that we have included language to reauthorize the Au Pair Program for 1 year to end the crisis that ensued on October 1 when this program expired. This program never should have been allowed to expire. I plead with the authorizing committees to move forward on a longer term reauthorization of this activity so that this sort of crisis can be avoided in the future.

This report also contains certain important policy decisions, including those respecting Turkey that I have already discussed.

In particular, I believe that the landmine moratorium provisions that we have included will prove exceptionally valuable in controlling the indiscriminate violence perpetrated by these weapons.

I am also pleased that we have expanded sanctions against the Thai military to force them to stop their cross border mahogany trade with the Khmer Rouge. Not only does this trade bolster one of the most genocidal groups to ever terrorize the planet, but it does so at an immense price to our environment—the Khmer Rouge are destroying ancient rainforests with the same disregard for nature that they have shown for human life. For reasons of foreign policy and environmental protection, these sanctions are badly needed.

In addition, I am pleased that we have stepped up the pressure on Guatemala to bring to justice those who are covering up gross human rights violations and continuing to perpetrate new violations to this day. This month's massacre of Mayan civilians by the Army make clear that the Guatemalan military is not reforming itself and is not respecting human rights. The recent beating of American Sky Callahan shows that the Guatemalan military retains no respect for standards of human rights. We should not support these butchers with U.S. assistance and we should not allow them to enter our country. In this regard, I call on the Judiciary Committee to move swiftly on legislation to rescind visas for members of the Guatemalan military who have been complicit in gross human rights abuses.

Finally, I want to mention the issue of satisfaction of certain obligations to Pakistan. I support the action of the conferees, although I would personally prefer to provide nonlethal aid to Pakistan. I would, however, caution the Government of Pakistan and its lobbyists here in town not to read too much into the conferees' action. This does not represent a retrenchment of our concerns about nuclear proliferation in Pakistan and it does not represent our picking sides in the tensions between Pakistan and India.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The gentleman yields back 1½ minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill continues a 10-year downward trend in financing for foreign aid, and that downward trend is unavoidable, given the existing budget crunch that we face. I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has done a fine job under the circumstances, as has the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], and I salute them both.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are some mistakes in this bill. I, for instance, do not believe that we should earmark funds for any country. I think that the Congress, unless we are facing extraordinary circumstances, should not be in a position to require the President to spend money on any country. I certainly do not oppose where these earmarks go. Israel, for instance, deserves great credit for steadfastly trying to move toward a resolution of the turmoil which we have seen in the Middle East for many, many years. I think that Egypt has cooperated fully in that process. I recognize in the past we have earmarked those Middle Eastern countries because we have not wanted to undermine the peace process, and I have no objection to that.

But I do question the wisdom of earmarking over 50 percent of the funds that go to countries that were within the former Soviet Union, even though, again, I have no objection if the President wants to support those initiatives to those countries, because I think we need to be engaged in that region. I would simply say that I have defended Republican Presidents for 8 years against earmarks by the Congress, and I feel obligated to do the same for a Democratic President of my own party.

There are some other problems I have with the bill, as anyone might, but, overall, I think that the bill is not a bad bill, and I intend to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, there is a problem: The bill as structured, provides for a return to the Mexico City language, which the administration strenuously objects to, and the administration has indicated that the President will veto the bill. I would not personally veto the bill over that item, but the administration intends to do so. So I will simply be offering a motion to recommit to try to find a middle ground.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will be providing an amendment, the language of which would cut off family planning funds to organizations with which the committee disagrees with respect to abortion. It would also cut off aid to the UN Population Agency because they have a program in China who the committee feels is conducting forced abortions.

My amendment would contrast with that amendment in this way: First of all, and I will simply read this language, it provides that none of the funds made available under this act may be used to lobby for or against



abortion. I think everyone agrees with that.

Second, it would drop the language on the cutoff of family planning assistance, because I believe that we ought to keep a very firm line between the issue of abortion and the issue of family planning.

Third, it would provide the same cutoff that the Callahan amendment would provide in China, except for changing the date. It would read as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this act may be made available for the United Nations Population Fund unless the President certifies to the appropriate Congressional committees that, (1), the United Nations Population Fund will terminate all family planning activities in the People's Republic of China no later than May 1, 1996; or, (2), during the 12 months preceding such certification there have been no abortions as a result of coercion associated with family planning activities of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China.

As used in this section, the term "coercion" includes physical duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressures.

I think it is important for us on both sides of the aisle to send a signal to the United Nations population program that we are firmly convinced that the so-called population program in China is in fact coerced abortion, or at least it is facilitating coerced abortion. Anyone who takes a look at the record understands that is exactly what is going on in China.

□ 1615

So all my amendment would do is give the agency 2 additional months to end their involvement in China or else face a total cutoff of funds. I think that is more realistic administratively and it would remain identical with respect to the rest of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to respond to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

No one agrees with him more than I do about earmarking funds. The gentleman taught me well when I served in the minority and he was chairman of this committee, or this subcommittee. I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly that we make big mistakes, and when this bill left the House there was no earmarking in our bill. So we both share philosophically the same idea with respect to earmarking.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that we had to agree to any, but this is a body of compromise and in this compromise we had with the Senate we had to agree to some things, but then they had to agree to some things. They wanted to come back and increase the amount of money, and I felt by earmarking some of the money for some of the countries that they insisted upon that the American people were better served by the reductions that we were able to save in spending in foreign countries.

With respect to the Mexico City language, this language that I intend to introduce is modified to meet some of the demands of the administration. I think we are at a point that the President must recognize that if he vetoes this bill because of the Mexico City language that is going to be therein that he will have to veto the CR, which will contain this language. So he will have to face it one way or the other.

Mr. Speaker, we have compromised with the President. We have given him every latitude. We have preserved for him the ability to have an effective foreign policy. But the President must recognize and live with the fact that the Smith language no doubt is going to be in whatever foreign operations bill we pass this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], my friend and former freshman Member 11 years ago in this House, a member of this subcommittee and certainly a good friend and big contributor to our efforts on foreign operations.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time. It is nice to be an 11 year old freshman, I guess.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. Let me commend Chairman CALLAHAN and our ranking Member CHARLIE WILSON, for a job well done. The conference report we are presenting to the House today demonstrates that we can produce a foreign aid bill which advances the foreign policy interests of the United States and plays a role in our Nation's highest national interest—balancing the Federal budget.

The conference report reflects a dramatic 11-percent reduction from the previous year spending in foreign aid. Despite this reduction we maintain our commitment to the Middle East peace process by fully funding the Camp David Accord countries. In addition, the conferees have added language which updates and strengthens funding to the P.L.O. and demonstrates our desire that the P.L.O. continue to be engaged constructively and responsibly in the peace process.

House conferees also accepted language which allows for a one time lifting of the prohibition against military aid to Pakistan. I voted in favor of this language because it has been demonstrated to me that the weapons in question will not alter the military balance in the region. In addition, the administration believes this language will facilitate an improvement in United States-Pakistan relations.

However, I believe the spread of nuclear weapons, particularly in regions of heightened ethnic tensions, represents the post-cold-war world's most profound security concern. I want to make quite clear that I will not support any future arms sales or arms transfers to Pakistan. And I am pleased the managers added, at my request, a reporting requirement on non-proliferation and conventional force reduction in all of south Asia. I think

this kind of report will aid us in making future policy decisions about the area.

In order to meet the 7-year commitment to a balanced budget, it is clear that we will have to continue to reduce the size of this bill. We must resist the temptation to try and fund all programs at diminished levels and continue the process begun in this bill, to prioritize and fund what works and zero out what does not work, no matter how well meaning or high sounding the program may be.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the House that we are well represented in conference by Chairman CALLAHAN and Mr. WILSON. They pressed hard to maintain House positions. Most importantly, Mr. CALLAHAN fought hard to keep this bill's spending as low as possible. They and the subcommittee staff; Charlie Flickner, Bill Inglee, John Shank, Nancy Tippins, Kathleen Murphy, and Terry Peel, did an excellent job in getting us to this point.

Foreign aid is not something for which you look forward to voting. But this is a good responsible bill and I urge the House to accept it and then to reaffirm its commitment to banning the use of taxpayer dollars to fund worldwide abortion.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

(Mr. TORRES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill and urge its approval. I want to commend Chairman CALLAHAN and the distinguished ranking member, Mr. WILSON, for their diligent work in crafting a very responsible bill within tight budgetary constraints.

I am pleased to note that the conferees have provided the full funding level of \$56,250,000 for the U.S. contribution to the North American Development Bank created under the NAFTA agreement. Because the NADBank is a new player in the international capital markets, obtaining full funding was critical to ensuring the Bank's financial strength and ultimately, its success. I want to point out that it is the one development bank that will directly assist U.S. citizens.

While the NADBank's primary focus will be on financing environmental infrastructure projects along the United States-Mexico border, it will also help individuals and businesses throughout the United States make adjustments to ever-changing global trade realities. The Bank's Community Adjustment and Investment Program [CAIP] is designed to address NAFTA related trade dislocation issues.

To that degree, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this will enhance the ability

of workers, whether they are in Keno-sha or somewhere in Seattle or Texas or California, to adjust to any job losses that are brought about by the NAFTA process.

In conference, I recommended that additional statutory and report language be included to limit and further define the direction of the CAIP. The language adopted by the conferees was intended to ensure that the implementation of the CAIP closely adheres to legislative intent. It was further intended to address a number of concerns that were raised by the conferees regarding eligibility criteria, personnel and operating expenses, and administrative accountability.

Specifically, the language regarding personnel and operating expenses was intended to ensure that the NADBank serve not simply as a pass-through for existing Federal programs, but that it fully utilize its authority to make loans and loan guarantees directly. The use of such authority by the Bank is clearly conveyed in both the implementing legislation and statement of administrative intent. The language adopted by the conferees acknowledges the authority of the Bank to utilize existing Federal loan and loan guarantee programs to implement the CAIP. However, failure by the Bank to utilize its direct lending authority would constitute noncompliance with congressional intent.

The language was further intended to ensure that the agencies involved in implementing the CAIP only assess the Bank reasonable and minimal administrative fees directly associated with processing of the loans or guarantees. Nor should a disproportionate amount of the Bank's budget for direct loans be used for administrative expenses. The Bank was never intended to supplement existing Federal credit programs and should itself be frugal in setting overhead costs.

The language adopted by the conferees regarding accountability was intended to ensure that the NADBank make the final determination regarding both CAIP eligibility and endorsement of projects for financing. It further recommends that each project should be endorsed for financing on a case-by-case basis. The language was intended to prevent Federal agencies from leveraging CAIP funds through credit programs that are not specifically tailored through guidelines developed by the NADBank to assist communities with foreign trade-induced economic impact. Finally, by recommending that projects be endorsed for financing on a case-by-case basis, the conferees wish to prevent any blanket endorsement of loans or loan guarantees made by participating agencies. Instead, it expects each loan or loan guarantee recommended for financing to be carefully evaluated by the NADBank to ensure compliance with its eligibility criteria.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] who is a member of our committee, and who is quiet but he is strong in his convictions and he is a tremendous complement to our effort.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and thank him for those kind comments. I will pay back by saying that I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has done an outstanding and remarkable job at being

the compromiser in the final minutes and all the way through, but especially in the final moments.

I also want to pay tribute to the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. WILSON], because I truly think this committee has done a great deal to work together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for this conference report which reflects the careful crafting by the House and Senate conferees. Balancing fiscal restraint and the needs of foreign policy, H.R. 1868 reflects the reasoned compromise and considerable cooperation that took place between the two bodies. It deserves bipartisan support. H.R. 1868 recognizes the fiscal situation we face and reduces the amount of money we spend on foreign assistance. But H.R. 1868 also reflects our continued belief in the importance of maintaining our role as a leader in global events.

This bill does not blindly slash foreign aid. We make serious cuts that reflect careful consideration and the review of every program. We have eliminated and reduced funding to those programs that have failed to justify continued support. This conference report is below the Foreign Operations Subcommittee 602(b) allocation. This bill will help us move towards a balanced budget.

Foreign aid is a crucial component of our foreign policy. The United States has a direct interest in promoting the expansion of capitalism and democracy throughout the world. Accordingly, I feel it is beneficial to American interests to aid countries which have shown a commitment to the ideals of free enterprise and individual freedom.

With the end of the cold war, there exists a sentiment in our country to place foreign affairs on the back burner and focus on domestic problems. We cannot ignore the domestic problems of crime, health care, education, and the economy, but I believe that recent events in the former Soviet Union, North Korea, and Bosnia illustrate that America must not insulate itself from the international community.

Faced with a national debt that is strangling our economy, Congress is operating under severe pressure to reduce spending and rightfully so. I am very committed to reducing the deficit, lowering taxes, and empowering individuals and business by reducing the size and scope of our Federal Government. But we must work toward these goals as the world's only superpower and the greatest proprietor of democracy. We have reduced foreign aid in this bill but we have not eliminated our ability to participate in the world.

Foreign aid which makes up less than 1 percent of our Federal budget is a good investment and has benefited our interests around the globe by furthering the development of economic and political stability in the international community.

H.R. 1868 allows us to continue to remain active in world events while it reflects our budgetary constraints. This

conference report reflects the joint work of the House and Senate. I support this conference report very strongly and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place a statement in the RECORD concerning administration policy.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The information referred to follows:

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, October 31, 1995.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1868—foreign operations, export financing and related programs appropriations bill, fiscal year 1996—Sponsors: Livingston, Louisiana; Callahan, Alabama)

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on the item reported in disagreement by the conference on H.R. 1868, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, FY 1996. Your consideration of the Administration's views would be appreciated.

The conferees have reported in disagreement provisions related to population assistance to non-governmental organizations. This is an issue of the highest importance to the Administration.

The Administration opposes coercion in family planning practices, and no U.S. assistance is used to pay for abortion as a method of family planning. The House provision, however, would prohibit any assistance from being provided to entities that fund abortions or lobby for abortions with private funds, thus ending U.S. support for many qualified and experienced non-governmental organizations providing vital voluntary family planning information and services. The provision would also end U.S. support for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). This would sharply limit the availability of effective voluntary family planning programs abroad that are designed to reduce the incidence of unwanted pregnancy and thereby decrease the need for abortion. The Administration also has serious concerns about the constitutionality of the House provision. If the House language were included in the bill presented to the President, the Secretary of State would recommend to the President that he veto the bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKEY].

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I add my congratulations to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] as well as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] for crafting what I think is a good bill under very difficult circumstances.

However, I rise to continue to express my sharp opposition to a provision in the conference report that would rewrite current United States law by severely weakening section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which prohibits direct United States Government assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan until that country lifts its blockade of Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, I successfully offered an amendment on this issue on June 29,

and the House approved it after 2½ hours of debate. The Senate also refused to include any language on section 907. Unfortunately, the conference committee, acting without a mandate by either the House or the Senate, decided to reinsert this provision into the bill; and I am strongly opposed to their actions in this matter.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] has suggested, correctly, that his language is different, correctly, as a matter of form, not of substance. The substance of the issue is to prohibit direct payments to the Government of Azerbaijan until they remove the blockade. That is the essence of the issue.

Mr. Speaker, the sanctions on Azerbaijan were imposed because of that country's ongoing blockade. When the Azerbaijan blockade is lifted, the United States prohibition on direct Government assistance can also be lifted. Countries that violate the conditions that Congress attaches for receiving U.S. assistance should not be rewarded.

□ 1630

Any attempt to remove section 907 must be viewed as support for Azerbaijan's blockade of Armenia as a legitimate weapon of war as well as support for their hostile position in the ongoing peace negotiations.

In closing, if we allow American dollars to flow to the Government of Azerbaijan, we will be turning our backs on the people of Armenia at a time when they desperately need and deserve our support. The true facts of this case are simple. The Government of Azerbaijan should act in peace, lift the blockade, and everyone can be made whole.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, seldom is a freshman Member appointed to the Committee on Appropriations, but even more seldom is it possible for a freshman Member of Congress to grasp the complexity of the appropriations procedure. But, the gentleman from Long Island, NY [Mr. FORBES] is one who has done both. His insistence as a promoter of the Middle East peace process, his concern about Mr. Arafat and the distribution of the moneys to Mr. Arafat, I think, is a very strong compliment to his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES].

(Mr. FORBES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of respect, obviously, for the finished product, but also I must express a grave reservation and concern that I have.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in memory of Leon Klinghoffer, and the events of the *Achille Lauro*. I rise in memory of the young woman from New Jersey and the young woman from Connecticut and so many Americans and Israelis who died at the hands, at the bloody hands of Chairman Arafat.

Mr. Speaker, I must tell my colleagues that I rise today because I am

extremely concerned. I am concerned because the taxpayers of the United States of America are going to be asked over the next 5 years to spend \$500 million to help Chairman Arafat build infrastructure in accord with the Oslo Agreement for Peace in the Middle East.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that Mr. Arafat, through non-compliance, systematic noncompliance, through a lack of accountability and because of his transparency in perhaps trying to talk the talk, but not walk the walk of the Middle East peace accord, is really disingenuous in this process.

I am concerned that the taxpayers of this Nation are going to be asked to funnel \$500 million to Chairman Arafat when, in fact, the PLO has not amended provisions of its charter which declare Israel to be illegitimate and calls for its elimination through armed struggle. The PLO has not legally banned terrorist organizations such as Hamas and the Islamic Jihad, and has done very little to discipline them.

Mr. Speaker, the PLO has failed to prevent incitement to violence and, in fact, PLO officials continue to advocate holy war against Israel. These are not the activities of a peacemaker. I must rise in strong concern for funneling of this taxpayer money, this U.S. taxpayer money to Chairman Arafat and the PLO.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the State Department made a backdoor deal in extending the Middle East Peace Facilities Act 18 months. So we are now pushing accountability 18 months out so that the Middle East peace accord could perhaps move forward. But some of us believe so that for political considerations, we can move this whole issue beyond the next Presidential election. I find that abhorrent. I find the fact that we are now going to say they must be accountable in 18 months, as opposed to 12 months, wrong.

Moving this accountability from 12 to 18 months is wrong, as it is wrong not to require Chairman Arafat to live up to the Oslo accords before he gets one thin dime from the United States taxpayers.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is important to be able to discuss this appropriations bill with an eye toward appreciating some of the very hard work that went into the ultimate bill that we now have before us. I do want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON] for working with me on some very important crucial issues.

Mr. Speaker, let me view the cup as being at least half full, inasmuch as we were gratified that in this bill that has cut foreign appropriations to the bone,

almost, to be able to support a valuable program, the African Development Foundation, with my amendment on the floor of \$11.5 million.

This, to the American people, I would say, is a constructive utilization of our dollars, because it relates to the grassroots that would be working with grassroots in Africa, teaching them and teaching the various nations and instructing them in how to produce, how to create jobs, and how to create income.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that that support was given, and I think the American people will find that though they have concerns about foreign appropriations, that this is well and a good investment.

Mr. Speaker, I do have, however, extreme concern about another bipartisan effort that I can proudly say was supported by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON].

I think it was supported in that context because they recognized that the American people say other things as well. They do understand that as moneys are appropriated for foreign aid, it is important that the values of this Nation, though we do not handicap our international friends, that we, in fact, do not abandon them and leave missing our values; our values of justice, social justice and human rights.

Mr. Speaker, we attempted to respond to those concerns expressed by many Ethiopian citizens in this Nation. Ethiopia is a great nation with a great history going through periods of great turmoil. Rather than to strap that leadership, we applauded what progress has been made, but we also acknowledged that human rights should be respected and that there should be a practice that would exclude or ensure the stopping of firing university professors because of their beliefs; that we should stop imprisoning journalists and magazine editors; that we should release Dr. Asrat Woldeyes, a surgeon, a champion of human rights; that officials of the previous Government should not be sitting in prison; and, that the military must be integrated to include all the people of Ethiopia.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON] had the opportunity to visit Ethiopia and remarked that there were great concerns that he saw that needed to be addressed. It is unfortunate that the very moderate language that we had included to save lives and to enhance the efforts already being made in Ethiopia, that someone and somehow in this conference saw fit to make many steps backward for human rights and not allow that language to go forward as it relates to Ethiopia.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that I am very pleased with the assistance and the recognition of this issue by both

the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], recognizing that it is important that the State Department be forever vigilant on these issues and that the American people would not want us to abandon our dollars and not provide our values.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield just a moment to the gentleman from Alabama to engage in a colloquy on this issue. I appreciate the work of the gentleman.

I note in the conference report that it says the managers expect the Department of State to continue to be attentive to this important issue as it relates to the monitoring of Ethiopia's human rights progress. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if he could help me to understand that we are going to view this in a very serious manner, recognizing that there are some great needs of improvement in Ethiopia and also acknowledging their progress.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, I agree with her. And in deference to her concern about Ethiopia, I offered the amendment, along with the gentlewoman, to include it in the House bill. But, when it got to the Senate, they had 192 changes and in this compromise they requested, as did the administration, it be taken out.

So, in a spirit of compromise we took it out. But to ensure and to protect the views of the gentlewoman, we did insert the strongest protection we could put in there saying that the managers expect the Department of State to continue to be attentive to this important issue and we as managers of this bill will certainly express to the administration our continued support accordingly.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that and I take from the gentleman's statement that that will mean a continuing monitoring by the State Department of Ethiopia. I request that the State Department provide us with continuous reports. It is an important issue, although we encourage the progress that may have been made in Ethiopia we should never abandon the human rights issue.

Mr. Speaker, I do understand the spirit of compromise. I would have hoped that we would not have compromised on the back of human rights causes, but I thank the gentleman from Texas as well for his help and I look forward to the monitoring of human rights in Ethiopia on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD:

Mr. Speaker, I must rise to express my concern about this foreign operations appropriations conference committee report. I am concerned that the conferees decided to strike an amendment to the House version that would require the State Department "to closely monitor and take into account human rights progress in Ethiopia as it obligates funds for fiscal year 1996."

#### FURTHER HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN ETHIOPIA

Mr. Speaker, Ethiopia is a great nation with a rich history. Recently, it has gone through periods of turmoil and unrest. It should be U.S. policy to bolster this nation and to monitor the actions of the new government.

We should all be pleased that there have been elections in Ethiopia. However, we must be diligent in ensuring that the new government does not follow the same path of the many governments that have preceded it.

Human rights must be respected.

Stop the practice of firing university professors because of their beliefs. Many of these professors have been educated in the United States and have strong ties to this country.

Stop imprisoning journalists and magazine editors.

Release Dr. Asrat Woldeyes. He is a surgeon in who has championed human rights and is a prisoner of conscience. The people of Ethiopia are suffering because he cannot provide health care services while he is detained.

Officials of the previous government are still sitting in prison and have not yet been charged.

The military must be integrated. Right now, the military is comprised of primarily only one minority ethnic group. It is a military of elites.

This issue will not die. If it is not contained in this bill, we will have to insert this language in future bills.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Committee on International Relations, I had an opportunity to read recent statements by Yasser Arafat regarding Israel and the peace process. Some of the statements that I read were hair-raising, to say the least.

He talked about things that fly in the face of the peace accords. He talked about war and torture and retribution. All of these things are not harmonious with the peace accords that we are talking about in the Middle East.

We extended in this legislation the accountability factor by 18 months. There really is no more accountability for Yasser Arafat to contend with for the next 18 months, and yet we are going to give him \$500 million of American taxpayers' money—\$500 million.

Mr. Speaker, while we are giving him this money we realize or know or believe from British intelligence that the PLO has between \$8 billion and \$12 billion in Swiss bank accounts and other bank accounts around the world. Eight billion dollars to \$12 billion, and we are giving them \$500 million for infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, while we are doing this, there was a murder committed. The security forces for the PLO in Jericho took an American citizen, 52-year-old Azem Musllh, an American citizen. They took him out of a restaurant and took him to a jail. His wife went to get him out of jail and they said he was not there. She came back a second

time and they said she would have to come back the next day.

Mr. Speaker, when she came back, he was dead. They said he died of a heart attack. When they saw the body, his jaw was broken. He had lacerations on his face. He had burns on the bottoms of his feet that looked like cigarette burns. The man had been literally tortured to death.

Mr. Speaker, this is an American citizen of Palestinian descent. Yet, we are going ahead and giving Yasser Arafat, even though he has talked against the peace process in some of his speeches, we are giving him an 18-month extension, \$500 million, and there has been no accountability as far as this man's life has been concerned.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill provides \$75 million; not \$500 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the \$500 million is the long-term agreement.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, but this bill is \$75 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, again reclaiming my time, \$75 million is the first tranche. Does the gentleman disagree that he is going to get \$500 million?

Mr. BERMAN. I think it should depend on what happens and how he performs.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman if he agrees it is going to be \$500 million?

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, no, I do not. I agree this bill has \$75 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the long-term agreement is \$500 million bill. While the bill has a lot of merit, this is one thing with which I take issue.

Mr. Speaker, before we give them one dime, there should be complete accountability about this man's death and those who tortured him and murdered him, who are members of the security forces of the PLO, should be brought to justice before one dollar of taxpayers' money should go to the PLO.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] has 14 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] reluctantly.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] for reluctantly yielding me 4 minutes to discuss the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in starting out that this is a good bill which I intend to vote for, but it has two points which I think are bad and which I would like to address at this point.

First of all, with regard to aid to Azerbaijan, which I talked about previously under the rule, I am hopeful that if this bill is vetoed by the President, and it does come back to conference, that there will be an opportunity in conference to address the issue of aid to Azerbaijan again.

□ 1645

I know the gentleman from Texas has in fact submitted slightly different language from what was rejected by the House. However, the substance of the language is the same. And basically what the language does is allow direct American Government assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] previously pointed out that the difference in the language, the way he sees it, is essentially that now, unlike before, the aid can go strictly to refugees, does not include democracy building, and basically allows the President to determine whether the aid is appropriate. But I would submit that when we had the debate on the floor back in June on the old language, it was understood and it was part of the debate that it was understood that we were talking about humanitarian aid to refugees, that we understood that the President would make a determination as to whether or not this aid would be given to Azerbaijan. So essentially there really is no difference here. The language is substantively the same.

The reason why those of us are opposed to this aid to Azerbaijan is because a decision was made with section 907 of the Freedom Support Act that it was wrong for Azerbaijan to continue its blockage of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. That blockade continues. There has not been and cannot be a certification by the President that the blockade is over or that any progress has been made to end it. And so it is inappropriate for us at this point to simply reward the Azerbaijan Government which continues the blockade of Armenia by saying that we are going to give you some direct government assistance.

It is also true that through non-governmental organizations aid does go to the Azerbaijan refugees for humanitarian purposes. They are receiving that. I am just hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that if this bill comes back to conference we can address this again because we did not have an opportunity today.

The other bad point in the legislation refers to assistance to Pakistan. I object to the language that permits the transfer of seized military equipment to the Government of Pakistan. This provision was not part of the House-passed bill. I am concerned that this language would undermine our Nation's commitment to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons, will heighten regional instability in South Asia. And as the New York Times stated recently in an editorial, send the wrong message to Pakistan. Why should we be rewarding Pakistan with

\$370 million worth of conventional weaponry when Pakistan deliberately lied to the United States about its nuclear program.

It is important to remember that Pakistan has not agreed to do anything in exchange for the release of the seized equipment and the language in the conference report imposes no new conditions on Pakistan. In 1993, President Clinton offered to return all or a portion of the weapons if Pakistan would agree to cap its nuclear program but Pakistan rejected this offer. This language should not be in the bill.

Having noted those two bad points or two bad provisions in the bill or mentioned them, I did want to thank the chairman and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and also the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and others for including some provisions in the conference report that are very favorable to Armenia. There is an \$85 million earmark for Armenia. There is the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, which we have been pushing for a long time. There is also the transcaucasian enterprise fund which is recalculated. I would be supportive of the bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, lest someone be confused about what is in this bill and what is not, there is no money and I repeat, no money anywhere in this bill that is earmarked for the PLO, for Mr. Arafat or anyone else in that regard. And we insisted upon that.

Included in the bill also, it says, new accountability number one, "New language which states that in providing assistance to Palestinians living under the jurisdiction of the Palestinian authority the beneficiaries of such assistance should be held to the same standard of financial accountability and management control as any other recipient of United States assistance."

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it from talking to the gentleman, the President has discretion on the \$75 million.

Mr. CALLAHAN. The President has discretion on nearly \$600 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, and that money will go forward for infrastructure for the PLO?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, we give that discretion to the President. They have earmarked some of that Economic Support Fund for Israel. They did earmark some of it in the Senate for Egypt, and we accepted those amendments. The balance of it, as it has been, I suppose, since the Economic Support Fund was established, is left to the discretion of the administration. If the administration wants to do it, yes, they can. But they have to do it under the guidelines and some of the accountability provisions that we have put in here at the gentleman's insistence.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I appreciate the accountability features that he has put in there. The fact of the matter is, the administration supports strongly the peace process, as we do and as I do. So that money will go forward.

My point is, and I know the gentleman can put a hold on this money if he sees fit, as some others may, I hope that he will do everything in his power to get accountability for this American that was murdered.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I will do everything in my power to insist on accountability. I will do everything in my power to insist that the administration does not give the PLO anything. But I just want this body to be fully aware that there is nothing earmarked, as two previous speakers have indicated, for the PLO in this bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

(Mr. BERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding me this time.

There are a number of points I would like to make. I rise in strong support of the bill and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. If you oppose the Smith amendment, like I do, understand the Smith amendment is not part of this conference report. The Smith amendment will be debated after the adoption of the conference report. I have strong feelings in opposition to that amendment, and I will express them at the time that the Smith amendment is up. My colleagues can vote for this report. If they vote for this report, they will not be voting for the Smith amendment.

The second point with respect to the administration and the veto, should the Smith amendment be adopted, it is not quite that simple. The Senate has taken a contrary position. The reason the Smith amendment is not in the conference report is because the Senate thought it was wrong to stop all funding of UNFPA and to stop funding for any voluntary family planning organizations. They realized that that action will contribute to a greater number of abortions rather than reduce the number of abortions. If the Senate does not agree with the Smith amendment, this bill will not even get to the President.

Third, this is a funny bill in a way. I am strongly in support of it because it does not cut foreign assistance as much as some would have wanted it to. The fact is, thanks to the work of certain Members on the other side, the efforts of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to reduce this function by \$5 billion were thwarted. While I believe this bill is not commensurate in terms of its funding with what should be America's role in the world and,

while I am concerned that this bill will leave the United States as the least foreign assistance contributor of any other industrialized country in the world as a percentage of gross national product, the fact is this bill, given the context of the year we are in, given what others wanted to do, provides enough assistance, I think, to continue the merits of the program. I support it.

The bill is significantly above what the bill was when it left the House. The bill provides more for the very important international financial institutions account and particularly IDA, to help the lowest income people than it did when it left the House.

The bill provides special programs for children and earmarks. One of the few earmarks in the bill is \$484 million of bilateral economic assistance for programs aimed at child survival and disease. The bill fully funds Israel and Egypt. It would be a tragedy at this time in the peace process for us to do anything that would diminish America's historic support for Israel's security as it enters into this peace process. I am very happy to say that the bill fully funds that aid.

One feature of the peace process, which this bill recognizes, I am no fan of the PLO. I am no fan of the way they have handled a variety of things. I have no doubt that there are aspects of the governance of the Palestinian authority that violate the human rights and liberties of the people living in the areas it now controls. The one thing I know is this peace process cannot succeed if the life of the individual who resides in the Gaza Strip or in the West Bank is not improved. The \$75 million in this bill will help to make that happen. It supports the peace process. I think it should be supported.

The bill has some features I do not like. As I indicated, I would rather see a higher level of overall funding. We are significantly below the administration's request. We are significantly below last year's level of funding. While I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], my friend, and a great deal of respect for his perspectives on these issues, and I like him quite a bit, I do disagree with his conclusions on two areas of the bill, Armenia and Pakistan.

I think the effort to economically strangle the small country, when we allow assistance to go to Azerbaijan, one of the participants in that strangulation, I am afraid we remove a leverage point to stop that from happening.

I also think the consequence of some of these arms shipments to Pakistan that will be allowed by this bill, my fear is, will reignite and accelerate an arms race in the South Asian Peninsula. Believe me, the Government of India will be here looking for compensatory treatment with additional arms. Pakistanis will be back. There will be economic pressures from our defense contractors to provide those arms. My

fear is that an already dangerous situation in the South Asian Peninsula will be accelerated. Notwithstanding those disagreements, there is very little question in my mind that this bill deserves our support, and I urge my colleagues to pass it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], a member of our Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of committee for yielding time to me.

This is a very good piece of work. It is the first foreign operations funding bill that I will support. We are cutting our foreign operations funding by a significant amount, 11 percent. If every part of government cut to that level, we would balance our budget in a very quick hurry in this place.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama, Chairman CALLAHAN. This is his first year as chairman. He has done a super job.

It has been a real pleasure to work with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON]. I am sorry to see that this will be his last term to serve, but it has been a real pleasure to work with him. He is a real expert on foreign affairs, and it has been a pleasure to work with him.

I compliment the work of the committee. I am proud to be able to serve on it because we have put out a good product, one that the Congress should pass overwhelmingly and send to the President.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

(Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on International Relations, I rise to express my concern and disappointment over several provisions of the foreign operations appropriations bill.

It is unfortunate that while Congress continues to spend heavily on weapons of destruction, funding is being slashed for constructive programs which generate international goodwill and help make poor countries more self-sufficient. I have had the opportunity to visit Africa on many occasions and have seen first-hand the positive results produced by the Development Fund for Africa.

Vital programs help address the scourge of hunger, illiteracy, and poverty. In fact, through foreign aid provided by American and other countries, the death rate for children under 5 has been cut in half.

Now, three accounts, including the Development Fund for Africa, have been combined and funded at a level which is \$450 million less than last year's level and less than the President's request.

The measure also cuts \$9 million from the President's request for the Agency for International Development, which administers U.S. foreign economic and humanitarian assistance programs in more than 100 countries throughout the developing world. I believe these cuts are counterproductive and fail to live up to America's tradition of humanitarian assistance to the people of struggling nations.

On the issue of Haiti, I am determined to see democracy succeed in that nation. I visited Haiti many times during the effort to reinstate President Aristide. I had the opportunity to talk with ordinary citizens of Haiti who are excited that at last they are in control of their country's destiny. I think it is important that impartial observers be sent to Haiti to monitor elections and determine the fairness of the process.

Other items in this bill which I find disturbing are the \$15 million cut in the Peace Corps budget, \$2 million cut in peacekeeping efforts, and \$1 million reduction for the Trade and Development agency.

Let me add that I was also disappointed, as one who is deeply concerned about human rights in Northern Ireland, that the conference report does not require that U.S. assistance be provided only to those who comply with the McBride principles which protect religious minorities. The fund was also cut below the \$30 million the President requested to a level of \$20 million.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the need for fiscal responsibility, but I believe that it is in America's best interest to invest globally. These cuts are short-sighted and will undermine America's stature internationally.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the foreign operations appropriations conference report.

□ 1700

Let me finally add that I was also disappointed, as one who is deeply concerned about human rights in Northern Ireland, that the conference report does not require that United States assistance be provided only to those who comply with the McBride principles which protect religious minorities. The fund was cut below \$30 million; the President requested to a level of \$20 million.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the need for fiscal responsibility, but I believe that it is in America's best interest to invest globally. These cuts are short-sighted and will undermine America's stature internationally. I urge my colleagues to oppose the foreign operations cuts.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN], who is a member of our Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] for yielding this

time to me, thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], and the subcommittee staff for all their hard work on this vital bill. We worked together to protect aid to our friends like Turkey, one of our most important and loyal NATO allies. Although this bill cuts over \$1.6 billion from last year, it does retain important programs like child survival, peace programs for the Middle East, and military financing for our allies. Foreign aid promotes U.S. national interests and gives the President the diplomatic tools necessary before resorting to any military force.

I am proud to support this bill, and I think it moves us forward in being the key player in the world, and I think that we have done a terrific job with the limited resources we have to maintain that role.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I urge the passage of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have only one other request for time; that is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], and he is not here, so, with that, I will agree to close.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say this is the best bill we can get. It cuts spending. It gives the administration the flexibility that they need to have an effective foreign policy, and I would encourage an "aye" vote on this.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to a provision in the foreign operations appropriations for fiscal year 1996 conference report that weakens current law prohibitions on direct aid to Azerbaijan.

During conference, a provision was added that will weaken section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, prohibiting direct government-to-government assistance between the United States and Azerbaijan until that country lifts its blockade of Armenia.

This provision was stripped from the House version of this bill after a lengthy floor debate that went on for over 2½ hours. In recognition of the House's firm action on this matter, the Senate opted not to include similar language in their version. The disregard of the will of both the House and Senate on this matter by the conferees is simply unacceptable.

Until the devastating blockade being imposed on Armenia by its hostile neighbor Azerbaijan is lifted, we cannot afford to compromise our principles by relaxing restrictions under section 907 to allow aid to Azerbaijan. The government of Azerbaijan has taken no steps to lift the blockade or even allowed the transport of humanitarian aid to Armenia through its borders. Given these facts, I firmly believe that a change in the law is unwarranted.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker I rise in opposition to the provision lifting the ban on direct United States aid to the Government of Azerbaijan, as long as Azerbaijan continues its brutal blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh.

Just 4 months ago the House of Representatives passed the Visclosky amendment with overwhelming support. The Visclosky amendment would continue the current ban on direct United States aid to the Government of Azer-

baijan, as long as Azerbaijan continues its blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh. The Visclosky amendment did not forbid humanitarian assistance to the people of Azerbaijan, only direct United States aid to the Government of Azerbaijan.

How can it be, Mr. Speaker, that the conference report provides direct United States aid to the Government of Azerbaijan, when this House overwhelmingly rejected such aid, and the Senate bill preserved the current ban? I will tell my colleagues the simple truth of the matter, as I did when the House debated the Visclosky amendment 4 months ago. It is greed, simple greed. It is the oil of Azerbaijan, and the desire of some to profit from that oil by helping the Government of Azerbaijan to build the infrastructure to extract and transport that oil.

Since 1992 the United States has said that the Government of Azerbaijan will not receive direct United States aid as long as Azerbaijan continues its blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh. This blockage has prevented the delivery of assistance to 300,000 Armenian refugees and obstructed the rebuilding of earthquake damage which left 500,000 people in Armenia homeless. The blockade by the Government of Azerbaijan has cut off the transport of food, fuel, medicine and other humanitarian assistance to the people of Armenia. Unless and until Azerbaijan removes its blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh and stops its oppressive conduct toward the Armenia people, the United States should continue to forbid direct United States aid to the Government of Azerbaijan.

I strongly supported the Visclosky amendment when it was before the House 4 months ago. The House spoke clearly on this issue by passing the Visclosky amendment with overwhelming support. I joined with many of my colleagues in the House and wrote to the members of the conference committee to urge them to preserve the Visclosky amendment. I also wrote to the chairman of the Rules Committee in support of the Visclosky amendment. I deeply regret that the rule accompanying the conference report protects a provision lifting the ban on direct United States aid to the Government of Azerbaijan.

Mr. Speaker, in this time of crisis the people of Armenia need our strong support. As long as the Government of Azerbaijan continues to strangle the Armenian people by this blockade, the United States should stand resolute and firm in the position that we will not provide assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report on Foreign Operations Appropriations for FY 1996 (H.R. 1868). This bipartisan legislation passed the House last July 11 on a vote of 333 to 89 and passed the Senate on September 21 by a vote of 91 to 9. The overall bill appropriates \$202 million more than the House bill, but \$2.7 billion less than President Clinton's request and \$1.5 billion less than the fiscal year 1995 appropriations level.

As our Nation's only democratic ally in the region, it is important for the United States to continue to play a role in assisting Israel's fight against terrorism, radicalism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It should be noted that this assistance is of help not only to Israel, but 70 percent of the aid is spent in the United States, and thus creates new jobs, economic expansion and opens up new markets for United States exports. While

being ever mindful of ways to find efficiencies within the Federal budget, the foreign operations budget consist of less than 1 percent of the Federal budget and yet helps create nearly 1 million domestic jobs.

I also want to take time to congratulate both the House and Senate for its leadership and swiftness in overwhelming passage of S. 1322, The Jerusalem Embassy Relocation Implementation Act of 1995. With over 180 United States Embassies around the world, only Israel has been denied the right to have its American Embassy located in its capital city. While Jerusalem is a holy city for three major world religions and home to thousands of religious worshipers, the state of Israel has never denied people of any faith from worshipping in Jerusalem. Now that the peace process is progressing, relocating the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem will hopefully strengthen that peace process.

Israel has been a trustworthy ally in a troubled and unstable region of the world, and it is my view that passage of these two bipartisan bills will help the United States reconfirm its strong commitment to Israel, to human rights, and to peace.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, it is with truly mixed emotions that I today will vote in support of this conference report.

There is much in this report that is good, and for the most part of those measures which prompted me to support the bill when it was on the House floor remain.

This bill continues our historic and important commitment to advancing peace in the Middle East. Israel is our strongest ally and is the only democracy in an unstable, volatile, and important region.

The American people have been partners with Israel in difficult days, and today as the prospects for peace appear more promising, we must continue to be a steadfast ally.

This bill also makes important refinements in the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act, toughening standards that apply to actions by the PLO.

As well, this bill includes several provisions which continue our commitment to support the people of Armenia. I applaud the inclusion of the earmark for Armenia, the cap on aid to Turkey, and the inclusion of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Relief Act.

These are good provisions. The United States must be beside the people of Armenia in their struggle against aggressors.

Unfortunately, the conference ignored the will of the House on section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. After two and a half hours of debate, on June 29 the House voted to maintain a strong Freedom Support Act and says to Azerbaijan, that we will not give you aid until you end your unjust blockade of Armenia.

This was right then. And it is right today.

What is wrong, in fact unconscionable, is to have Conferees turn their back on the expressed will of the House.

Democracy is based upon the simple idea that votes matter, that when people freely express what they believe, and the majority speaks, that they will be heard. By ripping the heart out of the Freedom Support Act, the conference report cavalierly said that votes do not stand for anything.

This back room deal is beneath this Congress. As people in struggling democracies



look to us to set an example, it is tragic that we set such a poor example in the very bill that defines how we relate to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this bill. I support much that is in it, but deplore what has been added and how that was done.

Those of us—and I remind you that it is the majority of us—who believe in a strong Freedom Support Act, will take our fight to another day.

We will not give up.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, Chechnya has entered the stage of a precarious balance between war and peace, one which is likely to continue for some time. The peace negotiations are currently deadlocked. The discussion of political issues, including the status of Chechnya, is supposed to take place once the military agreements have been implemented. However, the key military elements of the cease-fire agreement—the decommissioning of Chechen weapons, the withdrawal of Russian troops and the release of prisoners—are far from complete. And given the size of the chasm that exists between the two sides on these issues, it is unlikely that the basic armistice agreements will be implemented anytime soon.

Therefore, I am very encouraged by the fact that the conference report's statement of managers calls for no more than \$195 million for aid to Russia, with the remaining \$446 million in the Newly Independent States account to be used for aid to the other republics. My amendment, which was adopted as part of the original House-passed bill, cut and then placed limits on the use of funds for Russia in response to its continued aggression in Chechnya.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the discussion of political issues is important for us to consider as we conclude our deliberations of this year's foreign aid appropriation to Russia. Relating to the issue of prisoner exchanges, Russian and Chechen negotiators in Grozny agreed initially to exchange all prisoners of war and other people forcibly detained during the conflict. However, this argument began to unravel when it became clear that the two sides could not agree on the actual number of prisoners held. With all of the charges and countercharges and confusion on both sides, it does not appear that this exchange will be resolved anytime soon.

In the area of decommissioning weaponry, the Russian-Chechen armistice agreement provisions have created a truly confusing and frustrating situation. Russian forces continue to confiscate weapons while the armistice clearly stipulated that Chechens were to be compensated for turning over their weapons. But this was not the most serious post-armistice harassment perpetrated by the Russian military. On August 19, when the decommissioning of arms began, Russian soldiers opened fire on the village of Achkhoy-Martan, killing two children. The Russian military falsely informed the media that the children had been killed by an exploding mine.

However, we should be thankful that gradually, the Chechens are gaining control over this situation. Not only are the rank and file paramilitary Chechens returning to their homes, but also the commanders for whom the Russian intelligence services continue to search. While the head of the new National Salvation government says that he controls 90

percent of the Chechen territory, their authority in fact extends over Grozny only in the daytime. At night it is reported, that their power does not extend beyond the territory of Russian troops quarters, check points and commandant's offices.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to remain mindful of the delicate balance between war and peace in Chechnya. I further urge my colleagues to be cognizant of Russia's continued presence in Chechnya when voting to provide \$195 million to the Government of Russia.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to reassess our national budgetary priorities. In the past U.S. tax dollars have fostered democracy and fought poverty and disease throughout the world. I cannot in good conscience, however, vote for aid to foreign nations when America faces severe problems here at home. Thirty-seven million Americans lack health insurance, too many students are graduating from school unprepared to compete in the world market, and the United States is facing a huge Federal deficit. We cannot send aid to every corner of the world, and also make a serious commitment to tackling our problems at home. We simply cannot afford it all, and our U.S. foreign assistance program must therefore be restructured and returned.

While I support foreign aid in instances where there is a demonstrated humanitarian need, or when U.S. national security dictates protecting strategic and regional interests, I believe that we must take a serious look at the ways in which the United States has provided aid in the past. Simple cash or military aid that does not directly foster economic growth abroad may not be in our long-term interests. We must consider restructuring our foreign aid program to emphasize expanding U.S. exports, developing future markets for our products and encouraging economic development in other countries that are important to our national security. As long as we face demanding problems here at home and fail to reform the outdated manner in which we give foreign aid, I cannot support this foreign aid bills.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBEY. In its present form I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the Conference Report on the bill H.R. 1868 to the Committee of Conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the house to: recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: : Provided, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion.

SEC. 518A. COERCIVE POPULATION CONTROL METHODS.—Notwithstanding any other provi-

sion of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that (1) the United Nations Population Fund will terminate all family planning activities in the People's Republic of China no later than May 1, 1996; or (2) during the 12 months preceding such certification, there have been no abortions as the result of coercion associated with the family planning activities of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China. As used in this section the term "coercion" includes physical duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which the automatic vote by electronic device will be taken on the question of agreeing to the conference report.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 245, as follows:

[Roll No. 751]

YEAS—179

Abercrombie	Dooley	Johnson (CT)
Ackerman	Dunn	Johnson (SD)
Andrews	Durbin	Johnson, E. B.
Baldacci	Edwards	Johnston
Barrett (WI)	Ehrlich	Kelly
Becerra	Engel	Kennedy (MA)
Beilenson	Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)
Bentsen	Evans	Kennelly
Berman	Farr	Klecza
Bishop	Fattah	Klug
Boehlert	Fazio	Kolbe
Boucher	Filner	Lantos
Brown (CA)	Flake	Lazio
Brown (FL)	Foglietta	Leach
Brown (OH)	Foley	Levin
Bryant (TX)	Ford	Lewis (GA)
Cardin	Fowler	Lincoln
Castle	Frank (MA)	Lofgren
Chapman	Franks (NJ)	Longley
Clay	Frelinghuysen	Lowey
Clayton	Frost	Luther
Clement	Furse	Maloney
Clyburn	Gejdenson	Manton
Collins (IL)	Gibbons	Markey
Collins (MI)	Gilchrest	Martinez
Condit	Gilman	Martini
Conyers	Gonzalez	Matsui
Coyne	Green	McCarthy
Cramer	Greenwood	McDermott
Danner	Gutierrez	McKinney
Davis	Harman	Meehan
DeFazio	Hastings (FL)	Meek
DeLauro	Hefner	Menendez
Dellums	Hilliard	Meyers
Deutsch	Hinchey	Mfume
Dicks	Horn	Miller (CA)
Dingell	Hoyer	Minge
Dixon	Jackson-Lee	Mink
Doggett	Jefferson	Moran



Morella  
Nadler  
Obey  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Pryce  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reed  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Rose

Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabó  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Shays  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Slaughter  
Stark  
Stokes  
Studds  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornton

Thurman  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traficant  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Wilson  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
Zimmer

Upton  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh

NOT VOTING—8

Coleman  
Fields (LA)  
Gephardt

□ 1727

Messrs. JOHNSON of Texas, EWING, HOKE, FRANKS of Connecticut, BAESLER, and HAMILTON changed their vote for “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. PAYNE of New Jersey, FRELINGHUYSEN, GILMAN, FRANKS of New Jersey, GREENWOOD, MINGE, CRAMER, DAVIS, FOLEY, KLECZKA, EHRLICH, and KOLBE, Ms. DUNN, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 71, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 752]

YEAS—351

Allard  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chryster  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Cooley  
Costello  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan

Forbes  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Frissa  
Funderburk  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Geren  
Gillmor  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jacobs  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
Mascara  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allard  
Andrews  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Baldacci  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (FL)  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chabot

Chambliss  
Chapman  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (IL)  
Combest  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Dornan  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Ensign  
Eshoo  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fawell  
Fazio

Wamp  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield

Moakley  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Tucker

□ 1727

Messrs. JOHNSON of Texas, EWING, HOKE, FRANKS of Connecticut, BAESLER, and HAMILTON changed their vote for “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. PAYNE of New Jersey, FRELINGHUYSEN, GILMAN, FRANKS of New Jersey, GREENWOOD, MINGE, CRAMER, DAVIS, FOLEY, KLECZKA, EHRLICH, and KOLBE, Ms. DUNN, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 71, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 752]  
YEAS—351  
Fields (TX)  
Filner  
Flake  
Flanagan  
Foglietta  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fowler  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Frost  
Funderburk  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gillchrist  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Green  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hamilton  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heineman  
Hilleary  
Hinchey  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke

Holden  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson-Lee  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klecza  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lantos  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Longley  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Martini  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McDermott  
McHale

McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Mink  
Molinar  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reed  
Regula  
Richardson  
Riggs  
Rivers  
Rose  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabó  
Salmon  
Sanford

NAYS—71

Barrett (NE)  
Becerra  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Bunning  
Chenoweth  
Clyburn  
Coburn  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooley  
Danner  
DeFazio  
Dellums  
Dingell  
Doolittle  
Duncan  
Everett  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hayes  
Hefley

Hefner  
Herger  
Hilliard  
Houghton  
Jacobs  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Lincoln  
Lucas  
Martinez  
Miller (CA)  
Minge  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Myers  
Neumann  
Owens  
Payne (NJ)  
Pombo  
Quillen  
Rahall  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers

Coleman  
Fields (LA)  
Gephardt  
Hutchinson

Moakley  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Saxton  
Torres

Sawyer  
Schiff  
Schumer  
Scott  
Seastrand  
Serrano  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Talent  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Upton  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Waters  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Tucker  
Weldon (PA)

□ 1734

Mr. DOOLITTLE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. RUSH and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 752, I was inadvertently detained and missed the vote for final passage of the conference report on H.R. 1868. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

## LIMITING DEBATE ON MOTION MADE IN ORDER BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 249 TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENT 115

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the motion made in order by House Resolution 249 to dispose of the amendment of the Senate numbered 115 be limited to 20 minutes equally divided and controlled as otherwise provided in the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

## AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 115: Page 44, line 19, after "lizations" insert: : *Provided*, That in determining eligibility for assistance from funds appropriated to carry out section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, nongovernmental and multilateral organizations shall not be subjected to requirements more restrictive than the requirements applicable to foreign governments for such assistance: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. CALLAHAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion.

## PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR ABORTION

## Sec. 518A. (a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities may be made available for any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not during the period for which the funds are made available, perform abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

(2) Paragraph (1) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or to assistance provided directly to the government of a country.

## (b) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act for population assistance activities may be made available for any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not during the period for which the funds are made available, violate the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, paragraph (1) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) apply to funds made available for a foreign organization either directly or as a subcontractor or subgrantee, and the required certifications apply to activities in which the organization engages either directly or through a subcontractor or subgrantee.

(d) COERCIVE POPULATION CONTROL METHODS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that (1) the United Nations Population Fund will terminate all family planning activities in the People's Republic of China no later than March 1, 1996; or (2) during the 12 months preceding such certification, there have been no abortions as the result of coercion associated with the family planning policies of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China. As used in this section the term "coercion" includes physical duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 249 and the order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering a motion today that is an attempt at a compromise on the Mexico City abortion policy. Except for a technical change, it is the same as I offered in conference. Unfortunately, the Senate rejected my offer.

The original Mexico City abortion policy amendment was offered on the House floor by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, pursuant to the rule for consideration of the Foreign Operations bill.

It passed by a vote of 243 to 187. However, my compromise proposal would modify the House language in the following ways:

First, the Smith amendment as passed prohibited funding to both foreign and domestic organizations if they used non-Federal funds for abortions. The compromise would apply the funding limitation only to foreign organizations, either acting directly or as a subcontractor or subgrantee.

Second, I would modify the provisions on lobbying to apply only to foreign organizations, acting in a foreign country. That would remove

any hint of a constitutional problem with the amendment, as some have alleged.

Third, I would modify the language on the U.N. Population Fund to remove the funding prohibition for UNFPA if the President certifies that the organization will terminate all family planning activities in China by March 1, 1996. The agreement between the U.N. Population Fund and China expires on December 31 of this year, and this proposal would give them 2 months to phase out any carry-over activities. Frankly, if China and the U.N. Population Fund sign a new agreement, then we should terminate funding for the organization.

The modification to amendment no. 115 would also strike the Senate provision that puts into statute abortion policy that is contrary to the Mexico City policy. The language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the use of Federal funds to lobby for or against abortion would be retained.

The effect of this amendment is to return to the original Mexico City policy as practiced by the Reagan administration.

Frankly, I prefer the original House position on these matters. But I am interested in moving this conference agreement through the Congress, and I believe this proposal may be a way to do that.

I would also like to note that this motion has the support of the original sponsor of the amendment, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I appreciate his effort to work with the committee to fashion this language.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield my remaining time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama yields the remaining time that he has to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], which is 9 minutes.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Texas opposed to the motion?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, family planning works and we should not allow differences in our domestic policy to interfere with foreign policy.

The Mexico City policy allowed our country to make effective use of our foreign aid. Reimposing the Mexico City policy will hurt countless families throughout the world and increase the number of unintended pregnancies.

Organizations like International Planned Parenthood offer basic health care screening and information on how to plan a family. Denying United States funds to organizations like International Planned Parenthood just does not make sense. It is arbitrary denial of assistance where it is needed.

If we are serious, Mr. Speaker, about helping people not have unintended pregnancies, we should not impose the Mexico City policy. This policy works. Planned Parenthood works.

Why do we not just let the rest of the world do what they are going to do as we always do what we want to do?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to remind Members of the debate that we had not too long ago and in support of the Callahan amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Fund for Population Assistance has not had a history of which it should be proud in terms of its relationship with the Chinese Government. While they may choose to say otherwise, forced abortions and sterilizations do occur in China today. When Mrs. Clinton was in China last month, she condemned this practice. We can do no less than to back her up.

Last July, I had the opportunity to hear the testimony of Chinese men and women who had fled China after having experienced either a forced abortion or sterilization. One of these women was forcibly sterilized by the Chinese Government because she had the courage to pick up an abandoned baby girl by the side of the road. By adopting this little girl, she violated her quota of children although this little girl was not her birth child. This is anti-woman, both adult and child. It is also anti-family.

As Members, we have a responsibility to speak out for these Chinese girls who are abandoned on the side of the road and placed in literal death houses where they are left to starve to death. It is time to say to the UNFPA, enough is enough. No more dancing around the issue. Americans are sick and tired of being mocked.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the motion before us. This motion aims to completely eliminate family planning aid overseas.

Proponents of this language claim that it simply cuts abortion funding. What they have not told you is that abortion funding overseas has been prohibited since 1973. This language would cut abortion funding from its current level of zero to zero.

Therefore, this motion goes after family planning.

The world's population is growing at an unprecedented rate. In 40 years our planet's population will more than double. As a responsible world leader, the United States must do more to deter the environmental, political, and health consequences of this explosive growth.

One of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries is family planning assistance. No one can deny that the need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent and the aid we provide is both valuable and worthwhile.

And let us not forget what family planning assistance means to women

around the world. Complications of pregnancy, childbirth and unsafe abortion are the leading killers of women of reproductive age throughout the third world. One million women die each year as a result of reproductive health problems.

Each year, 250,000 women die from unsafe abortions.

Only 20 to 35 percent of women in Africa and Asia receive prenatal care.

Five hundred million married women want contraceptives but cannot obtain them.

Most of these disabilities and deaths could be prevented.

This motion would defund family planning organizations that perform legal abortions—even if the abortion services are funded with non-U.S. money.

The motion also cuts funds to the UNFPA, an organization that provides family planning and population assistance in over 140 countries. The pretext for this provision is that the UNFPA operates in China, and therefore the funding must be cut. However, the law currently states that no United States funds can be used in UNFPA's China program. Proponents of this language are clearly using the deplorable situation in China as an excuse to eliminate funding for this highly successful and important family planning organization. The UNFPA is in no way linked to reported family planning abuses in China, and should not be held hostage to extremist anti-abortion rhetoric.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion. No matter how its proponents try to disguise it, this motion is ultimately intended to end U.S. family planning assistance overseas. A vote for this motion is a vote against sensible, cost-effective family planning programs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Callahan amendment represents a proposed compromise with the Senate on the codification of the Mexico City policy, a policy that is supported by the vast majority of the American people.

I think it is important to note that this language does nothing to reduce U.S. funding of international family planning programs. It merely prevents taxpayer money from going to fund promotion or performance of abortion.

What we are trying to do in this amendment is to stop clouding the issue. To talk about private funds being used and no taxpayers' dollars being used is really quite deceptive. It does not really fool anybody. It is a shell game being played by these organizations. The American people do not want their taxpayer dollars being used to promote, perform, and support abortion policies around the world.

Since rescinding the Mexico City policy, the Clinton administration has committed over \$75 million to Inter-

national Planned Parenthood which performs and promotes abortion as a method of family planning, and they have refused to sign because of their radicalism to the Mexico City policy.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, just 2 months ago, women from different nations, cultures, and religions came together at the United Nations World Conference on Women, in Beijing.

At the Beijing conference, Mr. Speaker, women from around the world spoke about the need to increase access to family planning, particularly in the developing world, where an unwanted pregnancy is often a matter of life or death.

If you believe that women, rich and poor, should have the right to choose safe motherhood, you must vote down the Callahan motion. If you believe that women should have the right to choose how many children they have and under what conditions, you must vote down the Callahan motion. If you believe that the United States has the obligation to support the United Nations in its efforts to slow the Earth's exploding population, and the misery that comes with it, you must vote down the Callahan motion.

Support international family planning; support the conference report language for the foreign operations appropriations bill; vote down the Callahan motion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

□ 1745

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have said it once and I will say it again.

This debate is about more than just family planning in China or other countries. This debate is about the United States of America and a consistent policy that has been established from the beginning of this country and has been held forth until now.

But through a weakening of the commitment and the resolve to never, never allow for public funding for abortions, especially overseas, just through the rhetoric and through a potential treaty, that consistent policy could be seriously, seriously diminished.

Even as late as 1994, the General Conference on Population and Development held in Cairo reiterated that in no case should abortion be promotion as a method of family planning.

Mr. Speaker, we take great pride in the fact we have established a new vision for America and we have begun to establish a new trust for this Congress by laying out promises that were made; promises that were kept. And I think in all cases we ought to be able to say to the American people, "This is a promise that we have made and we will make it into the future; that there

shall not be this kind of foreign policy that shall be initiated."

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Callahan-Smith amendment. There are those who are trying to sell this as a compromise amendment. This is not a compromise. It is one side compromising with itself.

This amendment is still terrible in its impact on the poorest of the poor women of the world. Remember our policy in this country has always been antiabortion. Not one cent of this money goes for abortions when it goes overseas.

With the Callahan-Smith amendment, it becomes antifamily planning. The key to this amendment is that no matter how sick or malnourished a woman may be, no matter that she is carrying a seriously malformed fetus, she can not have a health service, maybe in the only women's health clinic that she has access to, like others could have because they can afford to pay their doctor.

These women that we are talking about do not have the options that Americans do. They do not have the many choices of health care providers so that they can get a medically necessary abortion from another source if the woman's health organization to which we provide family planning assistance is restricted from doing so. There are NGO's, nongovernmental organizations, that simply cannot accept these conditions, because the local law forbids it.

Mr. Speaker, there are countries in this world where the only organization providing family planning is International Planned Parenthood. This would say that International Planned Parenthood could not have money. It would take us out of countries where the average number of children per woman of childbearing years is 7; the average number of children produced by a woman in her childbearing years is 7, and we are going to take out the only family planning organization present.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Callahan amendment. One point must be reiterated in this debate—this amendment has nothing to do with abortion. Current law already prohibits the use of U.S. funds for abortion. For 20 years, foreign aid policy and law has clearly stated that U.S. funds cannot be used to pay for abortion services or to lobby on the issue.

What this amendment does do is gut family planning programs—resulting in more abortions.

The Callahan amendment would deny funds to women's health organizations

which use their own funds to perform abortions or lobby their governments on abortion policy. I urge my colleagues to recognize that the effect of this provision would be to kill family planning programs.

This amendment is an international gag rule. As democracy movements are opening up public involvement in policymaking throughout the world, we are seeing many private, local organizations becoming more vocal about the harsh reality of women's health. When I participated in the international women's conferences in Cairo and Beijing, I heard thousands of nongovernmental organizations speaking out, telling the world about the lack of access to decent health care in developing countries and of the obstacles women face in choosing how many children they want to have and can afford to care for. This international gag rule would inhibit these groups from providing health information to the public and prevent them from expressing concerns about women's struggles because—quite simply—they need foreign assistance to provide services.

The Callahan amendment is not a compromise because the restrictions would still impact groups throughout the world—those providers who best understand the local needs and problems. Supporters of the amendment argue that it would not impact U.S. groups, but, in fact, it will, because U.S. groups work closely with family planning partners in other countries.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly urge my colleagues to join in opposing the amendment.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to point out once more, just in case there is any misunderstanding, the statement of the administration policy, that if the House language were included in the bill presented to the President, the Secretary of State would recommend to the President that he veto the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great respect for the deeply felt commitment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for their position, but in strong opposition to their proposal.

You have heard it over and over again, and I will say it again: Current law is already antiabortion. This Callahan-Smith provision only makes it antifamily planning. Existing law prohibits use of U.S. funds for abortion activities. Our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], pointed out that for 20 years there have been adequate protections in foreign aid law and policy, the Helms amendment.

The House language is extreme because it would defund organizations that provide legal health services. Legitimate and effective women's health

organizations would be punished under this amendment simply for providing family planning information. The target of the House provision is the U.N. Population Fund.

Operating in 140 countries, UNFPA is the principal multilateral organization providing worldwide family planning and population assistance. UNFPA assistance is used for family planning and assistance and maternal and child care in the poorest and most remote regions of the world.

Since its founding, UNFPA has saved the lives of countless women and children. Further limitations on the U.S. contributions to UNFPA are unnecessary. No United States funds can be used in UNFPA's China program. No UNFPA funding is linked in any way to family planning abuses in China. UNFPA does not condone or cover up coercion in China. The United States Government should not, as a matter of principle, hold family planning and UNFPA hostage to the legitimate concerns we all hold and share about forced abortions in China.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, a little over 3 months ago the House voted overwhelmingly on two important pro-life policies, these antic coercion policies contained in the Callahan motion.

First, we voted to condition our support for the U.N. Population Fund on an end to UNFPA support for the forced abortion policy of the People's Republic of China. In recent months, the government-imposed nightmare of forced abortion and involuntary sterilization in China has taken yet another turn for the worse.

Mr. Speaker, the brutal one-child-per-couple policy has been around since 1979. This means quite literally that brothers and sisters are illegal.

In February of this year, the government announced a new intensified campaign against women who attempt to have a child without explicit government permission. The arrogant leaders in Beijing have decreed children should not be born, so population control cadres march out in lockstep and they force abortions on these women throughout the country.

Yet, and I beg to differ with my good friend from California, the UNFPA continues to laud this program as a totally voluntary program. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, could be further from the truth. Dr. Sadik, from time and time again on national television and in various fora, is saying the Chinese program is voluntary. She is whitewashing, unfortunately, these heinous crimes against women and children. She has even recommended that the Chinese program be replicated and reproduced elsewhere around the world.

Unfortunately, we should be lambasting and bringing scrutiny to these terrible human rights abuses, rather

than giving money to organizations that act as cheerleaders.

I was in Beijing, Mr. Speaker, when First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton gave an excellent speech on forced abortion. Unfortunately, she did not mention China, but everybody knew about whom she was talking.

We need to see the words matched with deeds. Unfortunately, rhetoric and condemnations are not enough. This kind of language, similar to what we had in effect during the Reagan and Bush years, will send a clear, unmistakable message that coercion has no place in family planning programs.

The other program or policy is the Mexico City policy, which simply seeks to erect a wall of separation between abortion and family planning. Again, the other side has suggested this is antifamily planning. Not true.

In effect since 1984, unfortunately repealed by Mr. Clinton, this program and policy sent money to groups, including International Planned Parenthood Federation affiliates who would sign on the dotted line that they would not promote abortion as a method of family planning.

If we are serious that these children who are killed by abortion have worth and are priceless and have value, it seems to me that we should be giving money only to those organizations that are truly committed to family planning and not those that have an agenda of promoting abortion globally as well as in this country.

Mr. Speaker, let me say finally, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has done an excellent job in crafting, as chairman of this subcommittee, language that is a compromise. We have given in on some points. The language before us, I think, should pass muster in the Senate, and we hope that the President—maybe not the first time, but sometime in the near future—will sign this into law, because it is right. Children have value.

Family planning is not reduced by a dime. By this language, it is conditioned only to those that promote family planning and not those that promote abortion.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to vote for this amendment, and would announce on behalf of the leadership that this will be the last vote of the evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 187, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 753]

#### AYES—232

Allard	Galgely	Neumann
Archer	Ganske	Ney
Arney	Geren	Norwood
Bachus	Gillmor	Nussle
Baker (CA)	Goodlatte	Oberstar
Baker (LA)	Goodling	Ortiz
Ballenger	Goss	Orton
Barcia	Graham	Oxley
Barr	Gunderson	Packard
Barrett (NE)	Gutknecht	Parker
Bartlett	Hall (OH)	Paxon
Barton	Hall (TX)	Peterson (MN)
Bateman	Hancock	Petri
Bereuter	Hansen	Pombo
Bevill	Hastert	Portman
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Poshard
Bliley	Hayes	Quillen
Blute	Hayworth	Quinn
Boehner	Hefley	Radanovich
Bonilla	Heineman	Rahall
Bonior	Herger	Regula
Bono	Hillery	Riggs
Brewster	Hoekstra	Roberts
Browder	Hoke	Roemer
Brownback	Holden	Rogers
Bryant (TN)	Hostettler	Rohrabacher
Bunn	Hunter	Roth
Bunning	Hutchinson	Royce
Burr	Hyde	Salmon
Burton	Inglis	Sanford
Buyer	Istook	Saxton
Callahan	Jacobs	Scarborough
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer
Camp	Jones	Seastrand
Canady	Kanjorski	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kasich	Shadeegg
Chambliss	Kildee	Shaw
Chenoweth	Kim	Shuster
Christensen	King	Skeen
Chrysler	Kingston	Skelton
Clinger	Kleczka	Smith (MI)
Coble	Klink	Smith (NJ)
Coburn	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Collins (GA)	LaFalce	Smith (WA)
Combest	LaHood	Solomon
Cooley	Largent	Souder
Costello	Latham	Spence
Cox	LaTourette	Stearns
Crane	Laughlin	Stenholm
Crapo	Lewis (CA)	Stockman
Creameans	Lewis (KY)	Stump
Cubin	Lightfoot	Stupak
Cunningham	Linder	Talent
Danner	Lipinski	Tanner
de la Garza	Livingston	Tate
Deal	LoBiondo	Tauzin
DeLay	Longley	Lucas
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Manton
Dickey	Manton	Manzullo
Doolittle	Manzullo	Mascara
Dornan	Mascara	McCollum
Doyle	McCollum	McCrery
Dreier	McCrery	McDade
Duncan	McDade	McHugh
Ehlers	McHugh	McInnis
Emerson	McInnis	McIntosh
English	McIntosh	McKeon
Ensign	McKeon	McNulty
Everett	McNulty	Metcalfe
Ewing	Metcalfe	Mica
Fields (TX)	Mica	Miller (FL)
Flanagan	Miller (FL)	Molinari
Foley	Molinari	Montgomery
Forbes	Montgomery	Moorhead
Fowler	Moorhead	Myers
Fox	Myers	Myrick
Frisa	Myrick	Nethercutt
Funderburk	Nethercutt	

#### NOES—187

Abercrombie	Bishop	Clement
Ackerman	Boehlert	Clyburn
Andrews	Boucher	Collins (IL)
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Collins (MI)
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Condit
Barrett (WI)	Brown (OH)	Conyers
Bass	Bryant (TX)	Coyne
Becerra	Cardin	Cramer
Beilenson	Castle	DeFazio
Bentsen	Chapman	DeLauro
Berman	Clay	Dellums
Bilbray	Clayton	Deutsch

Dicks	Kaptur	Reed
Dingell	Kelly	Richardson
Dixon	Kennedy (MA)	Rivers
Doggett	Kennedy (RI)	Rose
Dooley	Kennelly	Roukema
Dunn	Klug	Roybal-Allard
Durbin	Kolbe	Rush
Edwards	Lantos	Sabo
Ehrlich	Lazio	Sanders
Engel	Leach	Sawyer
Eshoo	Levin	Schiff
Evans	Lewis (GA)	Schroeder
Farr	Lincoln	Schumer
Fattah	Lofgren	Scott
Fawell	Lowey	Serrano
Fazio	Luther	Shays
Filner	Maloney	Sisisky
Flake	Markey	Skaggs
Foglietta	Martinez	Slaughter
Ford	Martini	Spratt
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Stark
Franks (CT)	McCarthy	Stokes
Franks (NJ)	McDermott	Studds
Frelinghuysen	McHale	Thomas
Frost	McKinney	Thompson
Furse	Meehan	Thornton
Gejdenson	Meek	Thurman
Gibbons	Menendez	Torkildsen
Gilchrest	Meyers	Torres
Gilman	Mfume	Torricelli
Gonzalez	Miller (CA)	Towns
Gordon	Minge	Trafficant
Green	Mink	Upton
Greenwood	Moran	Velazquez
Gutierrez	Morella	Vento
Hamilton	Nadler	Visclosky
Harman	Neal	Ward
Hastings (FL)	Obey	Waters
Hefner	Olver	Watt (NC)
Hilliard	Owens	Waxman
Hinchey	Pallone	White
Hobson	Pastor	Williams
Horn	Payne (NJ)	Wilson
Houghton	Payne (VA)	Wise
Hoyer	Pelosi	Woolsey
Jackson-Lee	Peterson (FL)	Wyden
Jefferson	Pickett	Wynn
Johnson (CT)	Porter	Yates
Johnson (SD)	Pryce	Zimmer
Johnson, E. B.	Ramstad	
Johnston	Rangel	

#### NOT VOTING—13

Borski	Gephardt	Ros-Lehtinen
Coleman	Moakley	Tucker
Davis	Mollohan	Weldon (PA)
Fields (LA)	Murtha	
Gekas	Pomeroy	

#### □ 1818

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. REGULA submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104-300)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1977) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 21, 24, 26, 40, 54, 57, 67, 77,